

A History of the Greek Language

From Its Origins to the Present



A HISTORY OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE

From Its Origins to the Present

BY

FRANCISCO RODRÍGUEZ ADRADOS



BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON
2005

This book was translated from the Spanish by Francisca Rojas del Canto

© Francisco Rodríguez Adrados, Historia de la lengua griega, Editorial Gredos, Madrid, 1999.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Adrados, Francisco Rodríguez, 1922-
A history of the Greek language : from its origins to the present / by Francisco Rodríguez Adrados.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.
ISBN 90-04-12835-2 (acid-free paper)
1. Greek language—History. 2. Greek language, Modern—History. 3. Greek language, Medieval and late—History. I. Title.

PA227.A37 2005
480'.9—dc22

2005047104

ISBN 90 04 12835 2

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

For Juan Rodríguez Somolinos
for his help with this book
and so many other things

CONTENTS

PROLOGUE
A History of Greek xiii
Fragmentations and Unifications xiv
Is a History of Greek Possible? xvi
The Present Book xviii

PART ONE

FROM INDO-EUROPEAN TO ATTIC

I. FROM INDO-EUROPEAN TO GREEK 3
1. From the steppes of Asia to Greece 3
The Indo-Europeans and Greek 3
Diverse theories 5
2. From Indo-European culture and lexicon to Greek lexicon 8
3. Greek within the Indo-European dialects 10
The Different Indo-Europeans 10
Indo-European IIIA and Greek 12

II. GREEK AT THE DOORS OF GREECE 16
1. More specifications on Greek 16
2. Common Greek (CG) 17
3. Essential characteristics of common Greek 19

III. FROM COMMON GREEK TO THE DIALECTS OF THE SECOND MILLENNIUM 22
1. Variants within common Greek 22
2. From the arrival of the first Greek dialects (East Greek, EG) to the arrival of the Doric dialects (West Greek, WG) 25
The diffusion of the Greek dialects 25
Greek in the second millennium 29
The arrival of the Dorians 32
3. Greek and the non-Greek languages in the second millennium 34
Pre-Greek elements adopted by Greek 37

IV. GREEK IN THE SECOND MILLENNIUM 42
1. East Greek 42
2. Mycenaean as a Greek dialect of the second millennium 45
What kind of language is Mycenaean? 45
Linguistic characteristics 48
3. Achaean epic as a Greek language of the second millennium 50
Diverse theories on the Homeric language 50
Our view of the Homeric language 52
4. Para-Mycenaean in the second millennium 56

V. GREEK IN THE FIRST MILLENNIUM: DIALECTAL PANORAMA 59
1. The expansion of the Greek dialects 59
The first expansion 59
Colonization 61
2. The diffusion of Greek 64
The alphabet and its diffusion 64
Inscriptions, literature and hellenisation 67
3. The creation of the great dialects 72
Generalities 72
Ionic-Attic 75
Arcado-Cyprian and Pamphylian 77
Aeolic 78
The Doric dialects 81
4. The unifying isoglosses 82
5. Secondary differences 84

VI. THE GENERAL LITERARY LANGUAGES: EPIC, ELEGY AND CHORAL LYRIC 87
1. The literary languages as general languages 87
2. The first general language: epic language in our Homer 89
Innovations in epic language 89
Formulaic diction and the renovation of epic language 91
More on the epic language of the eighth century 95
3. The diffusion of the first general language: the language of hexametric poetry after Homer 97
General overview 97
The different genres 99

4. The second general language: the language of elegy and epigram 102
Elegy 102
Epigram 105
5. The third general language: the language of choral lyric 106
General ideas 106
Analysis of the fundamental elements of the language of choral lyric 111
The evolution and variants of choral lyric language 114

VII. THE SPECIFIC LITERARY LANGUAGES: LESBIAN, BOEOTIAN AND SYRACUSAN 118
1. General overview 118
2. The Lesbian language of monodic poetry 119
3. Corinna's Boeotian 121
4. The Doric of Syracuse 122

VIII. THE LITERARY LANGUAGES OF THE ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL PERIODS: IONIC AND ATTIC 126
1. Ionic in the iambographers and in general poetry 126
2. Ionic prose 129
Generalities and beginnings 129
Herodotus 135
The ancient Hippocratics 140
3. The transformation of the Attic dialect into a literary language 142
Attic as an oral dialect 142
Sources 144
Characteristics 145
The oldest Attic prose 149
Mature Attic prose 154
Variants within Attic prose 157
4. The creation of the scientific language 161
The Presocratics 161
The Hippocratics 166
Attic literature 168
Example of a lexical system 170
Conclusion 171

PART TWO

FROM KOINE TO THE PRESENT

I. KOINE AND ITS RELATION TO OTHER LANGUAGES 175
1. Origin, definition and levels 175
2. The diffusion of koine 180
The diffusion 180
The 'koinisation' of the dialects 183
3. Colloquial koine and its variants 184
Colloquial 'koine' 184
The influence of other languages 185
Variants of colloquial 'koine' 189
4. Colloquial koine: general description 192
5. Literary koine and its stages 196
The first stage 196
Atticism 198
6. The evolution of the intellectual and scientific lexicon 203
Sources 203
Description 204
7. Greek and Latin in the Republic and the Empire 207
The contact of Greek with other languages 207
Greek in Rome 209
8. Hellenised Latin and Greek-Latin 213
9. Greek and other languages of antiquity 220
The languages revolving around Greek 220
Germanic, Slavic and Arabic 223

II. BYZANTINE GREEK AND ITS INFLUENCE ON OTHER LANGUAGES 226
1. Historical context of Greek in Byzantium 226
Historical data 226
Popular and higher literature until 1453 229
Literature from 1453 235
2. Description of Byzantine popular Greek 237
Phonetics and morphology (until the eleventh century) 237
Examples of popular texts 240

Phonetics and morphology (from the twelfth to the fifteenth century) 242
Examples of popular texts 245
3. The development of the Byzantine lexicon 247
4. Borrowings in Byzantine Greek 250
Latin borrowings 250
Borrowings from Gothic and eastern languages 252
Borrowings from western languages 254
5. Greek borrowings in other languages 255
General ideas 255
Borrowings in western languages 257
Borrowings in Slavic 264
Borrowings in Arabic 267

III. GREEK IN THE EUROPEAN LANGUAGES 269
1. The penetration of Greek-Latin in the European languages 269
Generalities 269
Hellenisms in the high Middle Ages 270
Hellenisms in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries 272
In Castilian 272
In French 275
In Italian 276
In English 278
Hellenisms in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries 278
In Castilian 278
In other languages 280
Hellenisms in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries 281
2. Description of the place and function of Greek-Latin in present day European languages 284
Origins and characteristics of this lexicon 284
Importance for the Spanish lexicon 287
An international character 289

IV. MODERN GREEK 291
1. The history of Modern Greek (MG) 291
2. Description of Modern Greek 297
3. Borrowings and culture words in the Modern Greek lexicon 301

4. The Modern Greek dialects 304
General considerations 304
Characteristics of the principal dialects 307
Dialects and MG 309

CONCLUSION 312

ABBREVIATIONS 317

BIBLIOGRAPHY 319

INDEX 343

PROLOGUE

A History of Greek

Greek and Chinese are the only languages still known to us after three thousand five hundred years that are still spoken today. They are not the only languages of culture that have been spoken and written for many centuries – some of which are still in use today, others dead, such as Sumerian, Egyptian, Hebrew or Arabic – but they do have a longer history and have had a greater influence. There is no doubt that, if judged by the influence it has had on all of the European languages, and continues to have today on all languages, Greek can be regarded as the most important language in the world. The direct or indirect influence of its alphabet, lexicon, syntax and literature has been and is immense.

This must be taken into account when embarking on a new history of the Greek language, after those of Meillet, Hoffman, Palmer, Hiersche and Horrocks and Christidis (ed.), among others, and a copious bibliography. Greek arrived in Greece and other parts in the second and first millennia before Christ and spread with Alexander's conquests, although its expansion was soon curbed by the resurgence of conquered peoples and, much later, by invaders such as the Slavs, Arabs and Turks.

Earlier, when the Romans had conquered the East, Greek continued to be spoken there. Indeed, from the second century BC it had a great influence on Latin and consequently, directly or through Latin, on practically every other language. This was a long process, as a result of which today many of our languages can be seen as a kind of semi-Greek or crypto-Greek (as I have noted on other occasions).

Today, Greek is a living language in Greece, but it also has a second life: its alphabet, lexicon, syntax and literary genres can be traced in all languages. In a sense, it is through these new forms, or avatars, as the Indians would say, that Greek has survived.

A new history of Greek must take these matters into account. Indeed, in dealing with Greek in Ancient Greece and Hellenistic Greece, it must highlight the literary, cultural and social factors which have conditioned the Greek language and in turn are expressed by it.

In its ancient phase, we know Greek by two means: through epigraphy (from the period of Mycenae onwards) and through manuscripts. Thus, we are able to study the fragmentation of its dialects and the unifying features that penetrated them until they were finally absorbed by one of these dialects, Attic. We can also study the different languages used in Greek literature; the specific languages used for the different Greek literary genres.

I will elaborate. First and foremost, we must place Greek within Indo-European: in a specific phase and dialect, and with certain starting points. In this book I will develop the ideas that I have expressed elsewhere: Greek as descending from the final phase of Indo-European expansion in Europe, which introduced a polythematic Indo-European – the Indo-European traditionally reconstructed. Within this polythematic Indo-European, Greek descends from the southern group, which had still not reduced the verbal stems to two, and within this still, from the group that preserved gutturals and a system of five cases. It is at this stage that Greek began to develop multiple innovations.

It is important to make a detailed study of what we can assume to have been Common Greek, its fundamental characteristics, from which it could transform, much later, into the great language of culture.

Fragmentations and Unifications

This is the starting point of the history of the fragmentation of Greek into dialects (perhaps already in progress in Common Greek), and of the successive attempts at unification which culminated in the imposition of Attic, and its derivative *koine*, as the common language of all the Greeks – a language which, with some differences, has survived to this day and has influenced all languages.

The two main dialects of Greek are the eastern dialect, which penetrated Greece around the year 2000 BC, and the western dialect (Doric), which penetrated around the year 1200. This is the first fragmentation, occurring outside of Greece and introduced there later. But there was a political division at the time (between the Mycenaean kingdoms and the later cities) and a dialectal fragmentation within the two main groups, which crystallised in the first millennium but which was perhaps already in progress in the second millennium.

However, this growing fragmentation was accompanied by the expansion of certain important common isoglosses around the year 1000. Indeed, there was tendency towards linguistic unity. Actually, common languages had already been created in the second millennium, linguas francas which had a specific geographic origin but which later spread throughout Greece: Mycenaean, an administrative language, and what I refer to as epic Achaean, the language of the epic, which evolved, and, in Homer in the eighth century BC, absorbed later dialectal elements.

Thus, there were unifying elements and the dialectal differences do not seem to have been very marked. But when the Dorians arrived they drove wedges between the dialects, isolating the East Greek of the Peloponnese from that of central Greece; at the same time, certain dialects of East Greek emerged. From this base, differences became accentuated: eastern dialects were created which were then exported, or had already been exported, overseas; that is, Ionic-Attic, Arcado-Cyprian, and Aeolic. These dialects were infinitely subdivided during the fragmentation of political power among the Greek cities. There was also West Greek, Doric, which in turn was also fragmented.

However, the unifying tendencies continued to grow. As already mentioned, from about the year 1000 certain isoglosses almost entirely invaded both groups of dialects, eastern as well as western. Although the Mycenaean dialect had already disappeared, the lingua franca or common language of the epic, the Homeric language, continued to exist everywhere in an evolved form. New lingua francas, or common languages of poetry, were also created: in particular, that of elegy (from the seventh century BC) and choral lyric (from the end of the sixth century BC). Of course, these languages had a specific geographic origin, but soon they became known and cultivated in many parts. Their Ionic element provided the base for the later diffusion of Ionic prose, and the latter for that of Attic prose.

In this way, literature was essential to the unification of Greek. Prose followed poetry, as I observed earlier: first Ionic prose became internationally known, then Attic prose, all towards the end of the fifth century. Although Athens was unable to impose its political hegemony, having lost the war against Sparta, it did manage to impose its linguistic hegemony: Attic began to infiltrate and substitute all the dialects, transforming them into *koine* or Common Greek. It absorbed the Ionic intellectual vocabulary, developed a new one,

and the *koine* continued in this same path. There was again a 'Common Greek', the base for all subsequent languages of culture.

Curiously, the power which imposed its political hegemony, Macedonia, played a decisive role in the diffusion of Attic. The political unity did not last, but when it died out, the linguistic unity continued. This is essentially the history, albeit in a very abbreviated form.

Yet the history does not quite end there. The new split was different: that of educated, literary or traditional Greek as opposed to popular or spoken Greek. It is known to us from the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine periods. Both strains continue to this day and are referred to respectively as the 'pure' (καθαρεύουσα) language and the 'popular' (δημοτική) language. At some point (from around the end of the Middle Ages perhaps, it is not known exactly), the 'popular' language began to split into dialects. A new and final unification occurred, based on the popular language spoken in Athens, after Greek independence. This saw the emergence of a new κοινή.

There are many varieties of the Greek language, and the study of their history is fascinating: from their Indo-European origins to Common Greek, and, subsequently, to the small regional dialects and the literary and scientific languages. Sometimes these languages need to be reconstructed, other times they can be studied in a more or less complete form. In any case, the task of interpreting their origins is not always easy. Indeed, at a particular point in time, all of these Greek languages shared common features, such as the Homerisms and Ionicisms of the literary languages, and, later, the elements from Attic and the scientific and intellectual languages as a whole.

Is a History of Greek Possible?

The history of the splits and unifications in the Greek language is a rather curious one. It is a story of the expansion of the territory in which Greek was spoken, and then its reduction, of political defeats and linguistic triumphs. Today, Greek forms the basis of a practically international language of culture.

There are many conflicting theories regarding the Indo-European origins of Greek, Common Greek and its dialectal fragmentation, as well as Mycenaean and the Homeric language. These topics cannot be ignored, yet the main emphasis in this study will be placed on

the literary languages, the socio-linguistic levels and the influence of Greek on other languages.

I will then attempt to describe the eventful journey of the Greek language through the ages: its influence on so many other languages, its role as the language of the Eastern Roman empire and later the Byzantine empire (as the language of the Church and State), and finally as the language of the newly independent Greece.

The influence and very existence of the Greek, within and without Greece, is fundamentally due to the cultural role that it has played. I cannot emphasise this enough. Other languages may have also served as vehicles of culture (some of which I have already cited), but Greek was the language that most transcended its own limits, along with the whole culture associated with it. Its acceptance at the court of Macedonia was of great cultural significance. It would later become the second language of educated Romans, and it was used by King Ashoka of India, the khans of Bulgaria and the kings of Meroe in Ethiopia. To be sure, Berosus, Manetho, Josephus and Fabius Pictor, among others, preferred to write in Greek rather than in their own languages.

Greek was often translated into other languages and vice versa. Its presence can be traced in the evolution of these languages, their literatures and cultures. Indeed, almost from the start, its alphabet enabled many agraphic languages to be written for the very first time, and it was later adapted to write even more languages, from Latin to the Slavic languages.

There is also the important theme of the unity of Greek, from its beginnings to the present day. Greek has no doubt evolved, but if we compare the different 'Greeks', from Mycenaean and Homeric to the 'common' Greek of today, there are not so many differences after all. The vocalic system has been simplified (quantities, diphthongs and musical accents are gone), the consonantal system has evolved slightly, and morphology has been reduced: there has been a loss of the dual, dative, optative and infinitive, a fossilisation of the participle, a reduction of verbal inflection to two stems, the development of periphrastic forms, and some formal variations. But the fundamental categories and the essence of the lexicon remain the same.

It is possible to write a history of Greek from its beginnings to the present, whereas it would not be possible, for instance, to write a history dealing with Latin and Spanish. In the history of Latin

there is a strong differentiation with respect to chronology and geography, while in Greek, a fundamental unity has prevailed in both of these aspects. This was because of the supremacy of the educated language, defended by ancient tradition and by the Church and State of Byzantium, while in the West it was Latin that prevailed, and later became fragmented.

This is the history that I will attempt to recount: an internal history of Greek and an external history regarding its relation to other languages. It is a very complex history, across so many centuries and so many 'Greeks'. I will expound my arguments in what I hope will be a coherent and accessible narrative, based, of course, on my own ideas, some of which I have presented in other publications. But this expository phase will occasionally be complemented with erudite notes in small print, providing information regarding the matter in question and the hypotheses put forward against it, as well as a bibliography.

It is not easy to write a history of Greek. To begin with, the earliest written records are nearly always documentary texts in the different dialects, ranging from Mycenaean of the thirteenth century BC to the various other dialects dating from the eighth and seventh centuries BC. Sometimes they are also literary texts, which have been handed down to us in Hellenistic and Roman papyri as well as in Byzantine manuscripts, and whose language or languages are in a problematic relation to the epigraphic dialects. These texts evolve and respond to various socio-linguistic levels: the lower levels being badly documented. How does one go about filling in the gaps and connecting all of this with an Indo-European origin and the later tradition? I believe that the main lines can be traced.

The Present Book

The justification for writing this book is clear from the above discussion: to trace the history of the totality of the Greek language and its influence on other languages. The histories of Greek, already mentioned, which we have today stop at Hellenistic and Roman *koine*, if not earlier. Indeed, Horrock's new history deals with archaic and classical Greek in a very summary way and only goes into depth in the phase from *koine* to the present. Ancient Greek is treated as if it was a mere precedent, and this is reflected in the book's cover

illustration of a Pantocrator. All of these works fail to discuss the influence of Greek on our languages.

My aim is to write a balanced history of the Greek language, leaning neither towards ancient nor medieval or Modern Greek. Also, I will explore the subject of the diffusion and influence of Greek, and its survival in other languages.

It is important to point out that one of the main purposes of this book is to stress the crucial role played by the literary languages in the two unification processes, corresponding to ancient and Modern Greek. Time and again, these languages have triumphed over centrifugal tendencies, transforming Greek into the model for all the languages of culture.

This book is divided into two parts. The first part will study the trajectory from Indo-European and Common Greek to Attic, the new language that became the common language. The second part will study the origin and history of this *koine* or common language derived from Attic, and the history of its variants from the Hellenistic period until the present day, through the Roman and Byzantine periods.

However, at times there will be a special focus on the creation and diffusion of scientific Greek, which has penetrated all languages, whether directly or through intermediate languages.

Some new bibliography, collected and commented by this author, will be found in my paper *History of the Greek Language 1983–2004*, included in Madrid, C.S.I.C. (forthcoming).

PART ONE

FROM INDO-EUROPEAN TO ATTIC

CHAPTER ONE

FROM INDO-EUROPEAN TO GREEK

1. From the steppes of Asia to Greece

The Indo-Europeans and Greek

1. Greek, a rich and flexible language which has served as the model for all subsequent languages, is only one of the descendants of the Indo-European language, or rather, the complex of Indo-European languages that were brought into Europe by nomadic hordes, from the fifth millennium BC onwards. These hordes came from the plains that extend from the Urals to the Tien Shan mountains, which close the passage to Xinjiang and the Mongolian interior (today part of China). Other Indo-European hordes, moving south, settled on the border of the Caucasus up to Anatolia, while others later continued towards Iran and India (or else arrived in Iran directly). Some went East, to the other side of the Tien Shan mountains and the Tarim Basin, in what is today Xinjiang, where the Tocharian language was later born.

2. Although there is disagreement on the dates, it is clear that towards 3500 BC, these peoples, who were already in Europe, destroyed the so-called ancient European culture, as attested in the Balkans by lithic representations of phallic gods and animals, copper utensils, villages and pre-writing.

Traces of the Indo-Europeans can be found in the *kurgans* or tumulus burials, which contain skeletons placed on a bed of ochre beside sacrificed horses, and in their fortified settlements (for example, Vučedol in the North of Yugoslavia, dating towards 3000 BC), among others. From the fourth millennium they had a bronze culture and horse-pulled chariots, which served as vehicles of transport and war. (For more details, see §§ 14 ff.)

It would seem that the Indo-European dialect from which Greek, among other languages, emerged (the language we refer to as Indo-European III) was spoken to the north of the Black Sea and to the south of the Carpathian mountains around the year 3000 BC. They

do not represent the oldest Indo-Europeans. They were a group of peoples which around that time had absorbed the future Thraco-Phrygian and Armenian peoples, and penetrated the South (no doubt along the shore of the Caspian Sea through the Gorgan plain), giving rise to Indo-Iranian – as attested in Babylonia, Anatolia (Mitanni) and in Palestine and Syria towards the mid-second millennium – like the Greeks did in Greece. The expansion towards Europe from the Balkans was more recent.

3. Within this whole group of languages, Greek and Indo-Iranian are very similar, but they also share common features with Tocharian and the European languages. But far more archaic Indo-European languages are known in Anatolia, which were certainly separated at some earlier date: the so-called Cappadocian tablets from Kültepe and other places, the oldest dating towards 2000 BC, attest to the existence of these other languages, which would later become known as Hittite, Luwian, etc., from the end of the third millennium onwards. This is Indo-European II, prior to Indo-European III, from which the Indo-European languages of Europe, Iran and India, as well as Tocharian, are descended.

4. Thus, within group III, European languages such as Slavic, Germanic, Latin and Celtic belong to the group called IE IIIB: they are more recent than Greek, Thraco-Phrygian, Armenian and Indo-Iranian, which come from IE IIIA. Its common languages can be dated, at the earliest, towards 1000 BC, which does not necessarily mean that there were no Indo-Europeans before that date, from previous waves of migration – concretely, those who left their trace on the European hydronymy studied by H. Krahe and others (which is not very old, as there are already signs of a mastery of the masculine and feminine opposition), and perhaps the 'Pelasgians', of which traces are trying to be found in the pre-Hellenic toponymy of Greece and in borrowings in Greek.

5. Most scholars agree that Greek entered Greece from the North around 2000; it is thought that one of its dialects, Doric, penetrated much later, around 1200. Actually, it is an indisputable fact that the invasion was from North to South in Iran, India, Anatolia, Greece, Italy and Spain. In addition to this, everything seems to indicate that Europe underwent invasions from east to west, and Asia from west to east (by the Tocharians).

Note that, in the historic period, Indo-European invasions continued from Central Asia to the South: Kassites (in Babylonia, fifteenth century BC), Cymmerians (Asia Minor, seventh century BC), Kushans (India, first century BC), Parthians (Iran, second century AD), and to the west (Scythians). Also, in Europe, the movement of Indo-European peoples (Slavic, Germanic and Celtic) to the west and south occurred in the midst of the historic period.

Thus, there is every indication that the Indo-Europeans left from the plains of Central Asia. The linguistic, archaeological and historical evidence coincide. The same thing applies to other invasions of Asian nomads, from the Huns to the Turks, Mongols, and others.

6. Today we tend to accept the hypothesis that postulates the plains to the east of the Ural mountains, as opposed to the plains to the north of the Black Sea, as the point of departure. The north of the Black Sea, where there are so many traces of Indo-Europeans, was merely an intermediate stage or temporary settlement. The horde that would introduce the Greeks, Thraco-Phrygians and Armenians into Europe came from this area, once it had separated from the group carrying Indo-Iranian to the east and later to the south. (See also § 25.)

Diverse theories

7. For a more elaborate discussion, with a bibliography, see M. Gimbutas's thesis on the successive Indo-European invasions, starting from Central Asia and crossing along the north of the Black Sea, in F. R. Adrados 1979a and 1998a. These papers also contain a linguistic argumentation on the migration wave that arrived in Greece around the year 2000 BC. Other works by M. Gimbutas, such as those of 1974 and 1989, describe the culture of the 'old Europe', known through discoveries such as those of Cucuteni, Starčevo and Vinča, among others: a neolithic, agrarian civilisation, with skills in ceramics as well as copper. See also F. Villar 1996a, p. 73 ff. on this culture and the Indo-European occupation. Further on in this book, linguistic arguments in support of this view of the Indo-European invasions will be presented.

Of course, the culture of the 'old Europe' of the Balkans is closely related to the neolithic cultures of Greece (Dimini, Sesklo, Lerna), Cyprus (Khirokitia), the Aegean islands, Crete (the base of Minoan civilisation) and Asia Minor (Çatal Hüyük). All of these cultures, in the Balkans and in Greece, had a strong influence on Greek culture: for instance, in the decorative arts and its representations of divinities, from phallic to animal (the bull in particular), including the naked goddess of fertility. They also influenced the Greek lexicon, which contains many non-Indo-European elements (or, in any event,

a pre-Greek Indo-European known as 'Pelasgian', although some think it is Luwian or Carian).

8. On the history of the problem of Indo-European expansion (the hypothesis that the Indo-Europeans left from Germania, Lithuania, Scandinavia, the Central European Danube region, the Balkans, Ukraine, etc.) and its arguments, cf. F. Villar 1996a, p. 28 ff. Here, it can be seen how the old arguments in favour of a Nordic origin for the Indo-Europeans, based on the names for 'salmon' and 'birch-tree', etc., have been discarded today. In addition, a localisation of the Indo-European homeland to the north of the Black Sea is accepted (together with the Danubian) by P. Bosch-Gimpera 1960 and (as a stopover) by Th. V. Gamkrelidze–V. V. Ivanov 1995. Actually, the Balkans is considered a second stopover.

9. See Villar 1996a, p. 56 ff. for a critique of the hypothesis of the British archaeologist C. Renfrew (1997, Spanish translation 1990), according to which the Indo-Europeanisation of Europe represents, quite simply, its neolithisation (without the need of an invasion) by a group that discovered agriculture in Anatolia in the seventh millennium; see a parallel criticism by J. J. Moralejo 1990, p. 274 ff., and another by J. de Hoz 1992. Renfrew's hypothesis ignores all linguistic data and adheres to the trend that rejects the fact of the migration of peoples (contrary to all historical evidence). That there can be cultural diffusion without migrations does not exclude that there are migrations, for which there is almost infinite evidence. In opposition to this trend (also supported by, among others, C. Watkins and A. Giacalone–P. Ramat, eds., 1995, p. 64 ff.), cf. Adrados 1979a, p. 34 ff., Moralejo 1990, p. 272 ff., 284 ff., De Hoz 1992 and Adrados 1998b. Furthermore, the identification of agriculture with an Indo-European influence is purely a priori arbitrariness.

10. Another recent hypothesis, repeatedly sustained by Th. V. Gamkrelidze–V. V. Ivanov (in his book of 1995), localises the area in which the Indo-Europeans originated in the Halaf culture of upper Mesopotamia, between the fourth and fifth millennia BC. However, the argument of cultural borrowings (the war and horse chariots, metallurgy) and lexical borrowings (Semitic and Kartvelian, if true) does not require such a localisation, these things could have come to them from the north of the Caucasus; the same can be said of possible common features (lexical, again) between Greek and Iranian, Greek and Tocharian. Also, the specific linguistic (morphological) arguments are hardly taken into account.

To be sure, the fact that IE contains borrowings from northern Caucasian as well as from Uralic, attests to the localisation of the Indo-Europeans at a certain point in the Volga region; cf. H. Haarmann 1996 (who proposes the fifth millennium BC).

Furthermore, Th. V. Gamkrelidze–V. V. Ivanov accept an early separation of an Anatolian branch of IE, as I do (cf. pp. 346 and 761). But their ideas regarding the migration of the Greeks (without the Dorians who, according to them, had gone through the continent) from Anatolia to

Greece – a hypothesis held earlier by V. Pisani 1938 (cf. Adrados 1974, p. 48) – cannot be sustained. The existence of Common Greek and its relation to Indo-Iranian languages rests upon the existence of a *continuum* running from Turkestan to the north of the Black Sea and further to the west. On the other hand, there is data available on the incursions and settlements of the Mycenaean Greeks in Asia during the second millennium (the Trojan War occurs in this context), but not regarding movements in Asia or Europe. On Mycenaean expansion, cf. M. Fernández-Galiano 1984, p. 231 ff.; on the Trojan War seen from this perspective, Adrados 1992c. M. Sakellariou 1980, p. 67 ff. coincides with our thesis on the existence of an Indo-Greek, which, according to him, would have originated in the lower Volga region, breaking off later.

11. As Villar clearly demonstrates, the three homelands that are today proposed for the Indo-Europeans are not so distant: they are located around the Caucasus, on either side of it. Both the linguistic and archaeological arguments favour the first hypothesis. In any case, it seems certain that the invasion that brought the Greeks into Greece came from the North, towards the year 2000 BC (see the bibliography in § 44). The most recent discrepancy appears to come from R. Drews 1989, for whom the tombs of the inner circle of Mycenae, towards 1600, would correspond to the first Greeks; cf. against this view, J. J. Moralejo 1990, p. 281 ff. For other, former proposals of a recent dating of the arrival of the Greeks, and its refutation, see M. Sakellaríou 1980, p. 32 ff. Although there are no actual linguistic arguments that are absolutely valid for choosing 2000 or 1600 as the date of the Greek arrival, archaeology inclines towards the first date. Cf. Adrados 1998b. Here, I provide a criticism of the idea of a separate Dorian invasion (proposed, of course, by J. Chadwick 1973, 1985, which I also argue against in Adrados 1998b and further on in this book in §§ 53 ff.).

12. I also reject the theses of A. Häusler (lacking any linguistic argumentation whatsoever), which bring up to date the old German thesis proposing the origin of the Indo-Europeans in the plains of eastern Europe: it denies any relation to the culture of the steppes to the north of the Black Sea. In a large series of works (among others, A. Häusler 1985, 1992a, 1992b), Häusler attempts to refute the movement of peoples and cultures in Germany and Greece, and any relation between the Indo-Europeans and the cultures of knotted ceramics and combat axes in eastern Europe, the tombs and stele of Mycenae, the war chariot and the horse in various places, etc. All is assumed to be indigenous (evolution *in situ*) or coming from Asia Minor. Yet, although the war chariot and the horse may have come from there originally, this does not mean we cannot maintain the hypothesis of their extension to the Indo-Europeans. Indeed, one cannot deny the connection between the Indo-European *kurgans* and funerary tumuli, such as those of the Scythians in the Ukraine, those of Thrace (Kasanlak, etc.), Macedonia (Vergina) and Phrygia (Gordium), not to mention the treasure of Atreus.

2. From Indo-European culture and lexicon to Greek lexicon

13. Much of Indo-European culture survived in Greece, as well as in the Greek lexicon which also retained some elements that have long since disappeared or been forgotten.

If the Greek language can be seen as the continuation of Indo-European, or some of its dialects to be more precise, Greek culture can be seen as a continuation of Indo-European culture, or a particular temporal and local phase of this culture. Indeed, culture and language go hand in hand. We need to examine how a particular part of the Greek lexicon is in effect a continuation of Indo-European lexicon, and the extent to which it continues to reflect that same culture, while adapting its semantics to new circumstances. The Greek lexicon was supplemented with a new lexicon, borrowed from other languages or especially created in order to reflect the changing historical and cultural circumstances.

14. This is not the appropriate place for an in-depth look at Indo-European culture, which can be reconstructed to a certain extent through archaeology, through a comparative study of the various peoples descended from the Indo-Europeans (including the Greeks), and through a study of the lexicon. The latter study is known as linguistic palaeontology: the recovery of things through words. It was initiated by A. Kuhn in the mid-nineteenth century, and its latest results can be seen in the work previously cited by Th. V. Gamkrelidze–V. V. Ivanov 1995, p. 413 ff., and in specialised studies (on Indo-European poetry, for example).

Thus, in very general terms, we can reconstruct the characteristics of nomadic, warring tribes that travelled in chariots pulled by four horses and settled in fortified areas, but never lost their migratory instinct. As mentioned earlier, this was a neolithic culture which nevertheless had knowledge of bronze as well as ceramics, woodworking, and weaving; it had domesticated animals such as the bull, cow, sheep, pig and dog; it cultivated barley, and hunted and gathered various fruit.

Its social organisation was based on the patriarchal family, which was united with other, more primary families within phratries and tribes which at times coalesced under the leadership of a king with military, religious and judicial powers, but limited by an assembly

of warriors. We have knowledge of their religion, with the god of day, **Dyēus*, their sacrifices and libations, and their oral, epic and lyric poetry.

15. After Kuhn, this line of enquiry was followed by A. Pictet, 1859–63. O. Schrader and A. Nehring codified this science in their *Reallexicon* 1917–1929. See also later V. Pisani, *Paleontologia Linguistica,* Caligari 1938, G. Devoto 1962, the volume *Paleontologia Linguistica* (Brescia 1977), in addition to E. Campanile 1990a and 1990b, p. 27 ff., F. Villar 1996a, p. 107 ff., and Th. V. Gamkrelidze–V. V. Ivanov 1995, p. 413 ff. On the Indo-European epic, see Campanile (cit.) and Adrados 1992c and the bibliography cited there (among others, H. M. Chadwick 1967, the same and N. K. Chadwick 1968, C. M. Bowra 1952, J. de Vries 1963, M. Durante 1966, K. Von See, ed., 1978, R. Schmitt 1967, R. Finnegan 1977).

16. The Greek language inherited most of the vocabulary that reflects this culture. For example, the name for fortified city (πόλις); social and familial organisation (γένος 'family', πότις 'lord, husband', πότνια 'of the husband, wife', πατήρ 'father' and various other family names); names for house (δόμος), the home (ἑστία) and crafts related to working with mud, wood, clothing, textiles, etc. (τεῖχος, τέκτων, ἐσθής, etc.); verbs such as 'to cook' (πέσσω), 'to plough' (ἀρόω, cf. ἄροτρον 'plough'), 'to spin' (νέω), 'to milk' (ἀμέλγω). Also, the names for the god of the sky (Ζεύς), domestic animals (ταῦρος, βοῦς, σῦς, ὄις, κύων, etc.), 'barley' (ζειαί), honey (μέλι), and the names for mediums of transport and of war (ἵππος 'horse', κύκλος 'wheel', ὄχος 'chariots'), etc.

17. Several observations should be made. Some Indo-European words that entered Greek – for instance, the word for 'bull' cited earlier, the word for 'lion' λέων), 'wine' (οἶνος), perhaps even the word for 'horse' – are probably 'old words' which both IE and Greek adopted from the Middle East as a result of cultural factors; there are parallels with non-Indo-European languages (Sumerian, Kartvelian, Semitic, etc.), cf. Th. V. Gamkrelidze–V. V. Ivanov, cit. These are considered to be Indo-European words, from the point of view of Greek.

However, when cultural circumstances change, some words survive, but with a change in meaning. Thus, the ἀρχιτέκτων can build in stone as well as wood, the τεῖχος does not have to be made of mud, the χαλκεύς 'bronze-smith' becomes a 'smith', the φρατήρ is now 'member of the phratry' and the 'brother from the same mother' (ἀδελφός) becomes simply 'brother'. If **bhāgós* was once 'beech', as it is thought, there was a change in meaning when it became φηγός 'oak, ilex'. Χόρτος became simply a 'vegetable garden' and lost all relation to 'patio, court', etc.

Yet, IE should not be regarded as a unity. Culturally speaking, it seems clear that although the domestication of the horse and the use of the heavy chariot for transport are very old, the light war chariot pulled by two horses was probably a recent introduction, from towards the mid-second millennium – the same applies to the word for riding. However, in IE, certain

cultural terms (for example, the name for 'fortress' or for 'bronze') appear to be dialectal. In turn, Greek terms can differ from one dialect to another. But it is not just a question of the lexicon. Today it is widely accepted that the first Greek poetry, mostly epic but also lyric poetry, followed the style of Indo-European oral poetry, with its formulas, similes, maxims or γνῶμαι, and even its metre. See the bibliography cited in § 15, and for lyric, Adrados 1984c, and p. 107 ff.

3. Greek within the Indo-European dialects

The Different Indo-Europeans

18. Given the current scope of our knowledge, we cannot continue regarding Greek simply as a derivative of Indo-European – that is, of the unitary and flat Indo-European traditionally reconstructed, called brugmannian. At most, some features of Greek were considered to be evidence of an evolution of this language.

There is not one but various forms of Indo-European, arranged chronologically and divided into dialects, also arranged chronologically, from which the Indo-European languages known to us derive. It is important to place Greek within this scheme, and to establish the dialect from which it derives. I have already laid the essential foundations.

In fact, the idea of a chronological ladder of IE is not entirely new. Meillet, Hirt, Specht and Benveniste, among others, speculated, for example, on the evolution of roots, the recent character of the feminine, the aorist, the thematic declension, and, even earlier, on an original non-inflectional IE whose traces can be found in the pure stems, the first terms of compounds, and certain adverbs. Other scholars looked for traces of agglutination or adaptation in the origin of certain inflectional forms. However, they continued to reconstruct a single IE.

19. The problem became more pressing with the decipherment of Hittite and other Anatolian languages. These differ in many respects from the reconstructed IE.

Sturtevant suggested a first solution with his thesis of 'Indo-Hittite' (1933, 1962, etc.): Hittite and Indo-European were seen as two different branches of this ancient 'Indo-Hittite'. However, there was no argument that referred to a diachronic difference between the two branches, the characteristics of which were dealt with very incompletely. His hypothesis made hardly an impact. It was generally

believed that Hittite did not contain certain categories such as the masculine and feminine gender, the aorist, the subjunctive or perfect, because it had 'lost' them. A whole series of phonetic and morphological archaisms were not taken into account.

From 1962 onwards (in my article 'Hettitisch und Indogermanisch'), I began to pose the problem in a different way: Hittite as proceeding from a stage in IE in which the following categories had not yet been created: the masculine/feminine opposition, the adjective's grades of comparison and the combination of various stems in the verb (the present, aorist, perfect and future; the indicative, subjunctive and optative). Verbal and nominal inflection was monothematic: as names and verbs only had one stem, verbal and nominal inflections (including adjectival and pronominal inflections) were deduced with the help of desinences (including ø).

This monothematic IE (IE II) represents a phase before the polythematic Indo-European (IE III) that corresponds to the traditional reconstruction. Of course, it contains more archaisms: from the laryngeals, the lack in quantity of vowels or the frequent identity of singular and plural forms outside of N. and Ac., and N. and G. singular in the thematic names, to certain features of the desinential system. Polythematic IE contains, apart from polythematism, various other innovations; and there is no lack of innovations in Anatolian, or rather, its branches (Hittite and other languages). In the same way, some Hittite archaisms are often found as such in polythematic IE (see § 22).

It must be assumed that the Anatolian branch representative of IE II was evidently separated at a certain point from the rest of IE; moving along the Caucasus, it then passed to Asia Minor and was immune to the innovations of the rest of IE to the north of the Caucasus (IE III). This coincides with that fact that our oldest Greek and Indo-Iranian texts date from around the fifteenth century BC and those of Hittite from around the twentieth century BC, as stated above (§ 3). But it is the linguistic argument that is decisive.

20. Of course, a detailed study of the historical aspect of this matter is not appropriate here, but it has been dealt with in the following papers: 'Arqueología y diferenciación del Indoeuropeo' (1979a) and 'The archaic structure of Hittite: the crux of the problem' (1982b), nor is this the appropriate place for a detailed argumentation.

A series of articles on this subject have been collected in my *Nuevos estudios de Lingüística Indoeuropea* (1988a). General expositions can be found in

my *Lingüística Indoeuropea* (1975) and especially in my *Manual de Lingüística Indoeuropea* II (1996a). In the work 'The new image of Indo-European. The history of a Revolution', I show, with the aid of an abundant bibliography, how there are more and more adherents to the new doctrine (often attributed to W. Meid 1975, who merely plagiarised me), even though the central character of the monothematism / polythematism opposition is rarely acknowledged. I must add the following authors to those already cited there, Th. V. Gamkrelidze–V. V. Ivanov 1995, pp. 344 ff., 757 ff.

Recently (Adrados 1998a), I have provided a global vision of IE differentiation. Furthermore, polythematism is not the only IE III innovation: others include the loss of the laryngeals, the introduction of quantity as a phonological characteristic of vowels, the demonstrative pronoun **so, *sā, *tod*, the personal pronoun **eg(h)ō/me*, nominal inflection with asigmatic N. sg. with a long vowel, etc. But there is still much traditionalism in favour of a unique IE and few innovations in Hittite, and there are still those who, obviating the bibliography and the data provided there, attempt to resuscitate the Indo-Hittite hypothesis (A. Lehrmann 1996). He could have at least read my article of 1992, published in the same journal in which he writes.

For the concrete position of Greek, cf. Adrados 1975a.

Indo-European IIIa and Greek

21. The study of IE II and its derivative Anatolian, with its various languages, is not directly relevant in this context: it is clear that Greek and the other languages considered in the traditional reconstruction descend from IE III, the polythematic branch which spread from the year 2000 BC through Greece, Iran and India (A), and more recently through Europe and the Tarim valley (B). It is thought that this type of IE was formed during the course of the third millennium BC: I have identified its expansion with the third of Gimbutas' migrations, towards 2300 BC. This does not mean that previous waves of migration had not managed to reach Europe: the pre-Germanic and pre-Greek Indo-European remains to which I have alluded must be attributed to these; I will return to them.

I would like to stress that the linguistic arguments so neglected by archaeologists are essential for an understanding of the originality of IE III. These arguments focus on innovations and choices, although, of course, archaisms identical to those of IE II remain here and there: traces of the laryngeals, the use of the pure stem in L. and other functions, the occasional correspondence between N. and G., heteroclitic inflection, verbs conjugated by only one stem (such as εἰμί in Gr.), the lack of the subj. (in Baltic and Slavic), the occa-

sional lack of the distinction of the same and the ind. (in Gr., Germ., etc.), and so on.

There are even archaisms which Anatolian had lost (the distinction of nominal stems in **-o* and **-ā*, 1st sg. in **-ō* without desinence, etc.). The choices are also notable: N. pl. in **-ōs* and not in **-es*, 1st. sg. mid. in **(m)ai* and not in **-a*, etc.

22. However, this is insufficient when it comes to establishing the genealogy of Greek: considering it a descendant of IE III is not an innovation on the traditional arguments that simply considered it a descendant of IE. We have only pointed out that this IE III corresponds to a recent phase of IE.

So, the task is to specify from which area of this IE III Greek descends. By referring to the previous ideas of, for example, R. Birwé 1956, and by anticipating the most recent discussions, such as that by Th. V. Gamkrelidze–V. V. Ivanov 1995, p. 347 ff., in the previously cited works I proposed the existence of an IE dialect that forms the base of Gr., I.-I., and Arm. (also, certainly of Thraco-Phrygian). I chose to call this dialect IE IIIA or Indo-Greek, the one which has been discussed. Cf. M. Meier-Brügger 1992, p. 65 f.

Faced with this dialect, languages that have been dated more recently, or more to the W., i.e. those of Europe (Balt., Slav., Germ., Lat., Ital., Celt.) and the E. (Toc.), would represent an IE IIIB, which is something fundamentally new: the most important innovation would be the reduction of the verbal system to two stems (apart from the fut.), the impf., aor. and perf. merging in the second.

This is the fundamental division: the old division into *centum/satəm* languages corresponds to a more recent phonetic phenomenon which intersects with the IE IIIA/B split and other characteristics. Another B innovation is the frequent use of verbal stems in **-ē* and *-ā*. Yet the presence of archaic features within group B is not excluded (for example, the desinence **-r* in Lat., Ital., Celt. and Toc.; the lack of the act./mid. opposition, of the subj. and perf. in Balt. and Slav., the occasional monothematism (as in *moli*, 2nd–3rd sg. pret.) in Slav., etc.

Of course, the existence of archaisms in particular groups is not excluded: apart from those already mentioned, B also preserves semi-thematic verbal inflection, while A preserves better the sense of the root and the derivation of stems from this root (in this way, various aorists may correspond to a single present and vice versa). A also preserves the opposition of the present and imperfect which

+--.0 is marked solely by the desinences, and the richness of the system of derivation and composition. Furthermore, there are innovations and archaisms that are specific to the different languages, Gr., I.-I. and Arm. in the case of group A.

23. The existence of common innovations in group A is fundamental. For instance, the relative *-yo*, verbal augment (also in Armenian), the elimination of semi-thematic inflection, the creation of the mid. perf. and plusc., the assignment of moods and participles to verbal stems, the opposition of a durative **bhére/o-* and a punctual **tudé/o-* stem, the future in *-s-* (also in Baltic), the tendency (completed in I.-I.) to establish four complete series of desinences (with the disappearance of the use of the pure stem, except in the thematics), the loss also (with exceptions in I.-I.) of the des. **-r*, the lack of composed verbal stems (except for Gr. -θη) and of **-ē* and **ā* stems (except for Gr. -η), etc.

Greek also often innovates with respect to Sanskrit: for example in the assignment of an infinitive to every verbal stem and in the almost complete destruction of the complicated system of present tenses derived from the same root.

Yet, with all its innovations, the IIIA dialect is fundamentally archaic in its preservation of the four verbal stems of the present, aorist, perfect and future. This coincides with its older diffusion. It has produced languages with a continuous, southern localisation: they spread to Iran and India, to Greece and Asia Minor. In connection with this, I have suggested the existence of a southern horde (or a group of them), which penetrated Europe through the south of the Carpathian mountains, and certainly advanced westwards at an earlier date than the hordes which penetrated through the north of the Carpathians, creating various European languages of the IIIB type.

Without a doubt, the predecessors of the Greeks were at the head of the southern horde, which carried IE IIIA: from the Balkans they turned southwards, the Thracians trailing behind them as well as the Phrygians and Armenians, who crossed to Asia Minor. In contrast, the predecessors of the Iranians and Indians moved (though not always) to the East and then descended to Iran and India.

24. The establishment of the fundamental characteristics of IE IIIA is essential for determining the archaisms, choices and innovations of Greek. But it must be pointed out that the separation of the two branches or dialects into A and B is not absolute: there was certainly contact between the two

before the continuity of the languages was dissolved, in the Russian or European plains. Sometimes all or part of the A branch coincides with the B branch.

The more or less complete satemisation of certain languages of a particular group, the coincidence in the confusion of the vowels, etc., are good examples. As far as morphology is concerned, we can cite, for instance, the presence of the superlative suffix **-isto-* in Gr., I.-I. and Germ.; the case desinence **-bhi*, belonging to group A, which is also present in Lat, Celt., etc.; concordance in personal pronouns (G. of 1st pers. Av. *mana*, OSlav. *mene*, Lith. *manė́*, Ac. OIn. *mām*, OSlav. *mę*), in the prohibitive negation **mē* (in I.-I., Balt.); the future in *-s* (Gr., I.-I., Balt.); participles in *-lo* (Arm. and Slav.); the diffusion of verbal stems in **-ē* (Gr., Arm., Toc., etc.); the creation of a complete inflection for denominatives and deverbatives (but not in I.-I.); the N. pl. in **-oi* in thematic names (in Gr., Lat., OSlav., Germ., part of Celtic); the dual (Gr., I.-I., Balto-Slav. and part of Germ.), and so on.

These are thought to be innovations or choices, as the case may be. But there are also archaisms, such as the nominal system with five cases and a unique form of D.-L.-I. (in Gr., Germ., and Celt.) – although some would consider this an innovation – and heteroclitic inflection, of which there are traces in Latin.

All of this is significant in that it lays the foundations for an examination of the facts surrounding the Greek language, for it is not only a continuation of IE IIIA, which is not always unitary, but it also coincides with particular language of IIIB, as we shall see. This can be seen as distinct from its differentiation within group IIIA itself. We believe that, by leading the IE IIIA hordes, its main contact was with the rearguard of the IIIB hordes, especially with the Baltic and Slavic languages: this is revealed in their common features.

For a more detailed account of these ideas, see (among other works) Adrados 1979a, 1990b, 1992c and 1996a.

CHAPTER TWO

GREEK AT THE DOORS OF GREECE

1. More specifications on Greek

25. I would like to stress the relationship between Greek and the Indo-European languages. We have already pointed out that the Indo-Greek group or IE IIIA, whether in its entirety or in a certain language in particular, often displays similarities with the group IIIB languages: whether in archaisms, innovations or choices. I would now like to highlight this phenomenon, focusing on the Greek language.

Sometimes Greek preserves archaisms that were lost in I.–I.: generally, in connection with other languages (this is not surprising, given that an archaism may emerge anywhere). For instance, there is declension into five cases (also in Germ. and Celt.); athematic inflection of denominatives and deverbatives in the 3rd pers. pl. -ᾱσι, -ησι (also in Lat., Germ., etc., but in Gr. only in Aeolic); possibly, the lack of the personal G. **mene* (in phonetics, the character *centum).* However, sometimes it is I.–I. which displays an archaism that was lost to Greek, which innovates alone or with other languages: we find monothematic inflection of denominatives and deverbatives, one infinitive per verb which is not assigned to the stems, the lack of verbal stems with the long vowel *-ē* or **-ā*, etc.

Here is a short list of the forms which the innovations or choices of Greek, together with other languages, may take: the dual, the N. pl. in **-oi* and verbal stems in **-ē* and **-ā*, as cited previously; compound verbal stems (with -θη, with other variants in Lat., Ital., Germ., Sla., Balt., e.g. Lat. *amabam,* etc.); G. pl. in **-āsōm* (in Gr. and Lat.); the gentilitious adjective in *-os* (as an archaism in Gr., and also present in Lat.), etc. In addition, in phonetics, the vocalisation of *<r, *l> with *o*, as in Lat. (but in Gr., only in Aeolic); and the vocalic prothesis before a sonant (only in Arm.).

26. Given that the horde from which Greek would emerge was in the vanguard of all the hordes that travelled along the northern coast of the Black Sea and penetrated Europe through the south of the Carpathian mountains, it is not surprising that, on occasion, Greek

should have come into contact with the rearguard of the northern horde of IE IIIB—corresponding to the Slavic, Baltic, and even Germanic and Latin peoples (which in turn came into contact with the Italic and Celtic peoples).

Of course, all of this implies, firstly, that the future Greek dialects could preserve archaisms or introduce innovations of their own accord, thereby distinguishing themselves from I.-I. They could also come into contact, at various points (certainly at a relatively recent point in time) with the northern hordes.

In other words, the unity of IE IIIA was not absolute, and one of its branches could evolve at different points in time. Indeed, even this branch was not absolutely unified, undergoing internal splits in its contacts with the northern and western dialects. Internally, a process of breaking away or differentiation, which would later advance within Greece, had certainly begun, besides the evolutions that affected the whole Greek dialect.

27. For more details, see various of my publications, especially (among other earlier works) 'Sánscrito e Indoeuropeo' (1975a), 'La dialectología griega' (1984a) and 'Las lenguas eslavas en el contexto de las lenguas indoeuropeas' (1980b), collected in Adrados 1988a; see also 'De la Dialectología griega de 1952 a la Dialectología griega de 1995' (Madrid, 1998b).

2. Common Greek (CG)

28. Common Greek flourished shortly before the year 2000 BC in an area of northern Greece. This was a Greek dialect which did not display an absolute unity and contained its own archaisms and innovations and choices, linking it, at certain points, to other Indo-European dialects. This dialect contained various lines of fracture, but it also had its own exclusive innovations, which I must discuss.

It was normal to speak of 'common languages' during a period in which the image of the 'genealogical tree' (*Stammbaumtheorie*) was dominant as regards the evolution of languages. Then came the 'theory of the waves' (*Wellentheorie*), which brought expansive waves of diverse innovations to our attention, with a tendency to converge on a central nucleus, but to organise into 'bundles of isoglosses' on the limits: now one could not speak of common intermediate languages. A struggle against these was launched in the scientific literature. Furthermore, with the arrival of anti-migrationism and the idea that

languages are created through the convergence of various other languages (for Greek, see V. Pisani and Th. V. Gamkrelidze), the theory of common intermediate languages tended to be abandoned.

Faced with this idea, on a number of occasions (most recently in Adrados 1998a) I have defended the view that Common Greek and the other 'common languages' did in fact exist. Of course, not as absolutely closed and uniform dialects, but as lax units, related to a particular region, and other surrounding regions, in which there was an incipient internal fragmentation. In fact, there is no such thing as an absolutely uniform dialect: why should we expect there to be such, in a preliterate period with a merely tribal political organisation? Many of us had already long anticipated the ideas of M. Bile–C. Brixhe–R. Hodot 1984 regarding the lack of total unity in dialects.

The most curious thing, as far as Greek is concerned, is the progressively increasing popularity of the idea that its dialectal fragmentation took place exclusively within Greece. This is perhaps an understandable (though terribly excessive) reaction to the ideas held by Kretschmer, Tovar and myself regarding the origin of Greek dialects outside of Greece.

29. However, in various works (especially 1976a and b, 1984a), which culminate in my book of 1998b, I have always defended the theory of a Common Greek: fundamentally unitary, but with budding differentiation. This is in no way incompatible with the later origin of certain dialectal characteristics.

The idea of a convergence of dialects (Pisani, Gamkrelidze) in the creation of Greek is just as ludicrous as the idea of Mycenaean as the convergence of dialects (Georgiev) or Chadwick's idea that there was only ever one Greek migration: the Dorian peoples would be seen as submitted subjects to the Mycenaeans, and at some point revolting against them.

It is evident that the peoples who brought the Doric dialects to Greece towards the year 1200 BC formed a part of Common Greek: there is no reason to dispute this traditional view. Doric is essentially an archaic form of Greek that has not received the innovations and choices peculiar to East Greek, which penetrated Greece at an earlier date and from which the other dialects descend. It is likely that many of these innovations and choices would have already been present, *in statu nascendi*, in Common Greek, for example those that join Aeolic with the western Indo-European dialects, IIIB, as we have seen.

3. Essential characteristics of common Greek

30. Here, I will summarise the opinions regarding Common Greek which have been presented in previous publications already cited. I will start with the essential characteristics and continue with the internal variants that they no doubt entailed. Naturally, I will not look at those common characteristics of Greek that emerged later as a product of internal evolution, such as the creation of the article.

I have placed Greek within Indo-European and, more specifically, within IIIA. But it is now essential to present its fundamental characteristics, which are no doubt present in Common Greek, in a schematic way. These characteristics are present in the most ancient dialects, recent innovations not taken into account. They are also the result of the evolution of Greek as a literary language.

31. Greek preserved the musical accent of IE and its system of five short and five long vowels. In archaic times, *i and *u could have the semi-vocalic forms of *y, *w, which were later lost; whereas the vocalic forms of the sonants were lost (although there is a view, which I do not hold, that <*r> were preserved in Homer and Mycenaean). The laws of Osthoff and Grassmann had been fulfilled. The three laryngeals in a vocalic position had become vocalised as ε, α, ο (in certain different contexts).

32. For the supposed preservation of <*r> in Homer and Mycenaean, cf., among other bibliography, Heubeck 1972; against this preservation, see J. J. Moralejo 1973b and my 'Mycenaean . . .' (Adrados 1976a, compiled in Adrados 1988a, cf. p. 450). For the dating of vocalisation in CG, cf. my work Adrados 1976b, p. 260 ff., and my statements about this vocalisation in my article of 1958 (followed by many others). Cf. also A. Bernabé 1977.

33. With regard to the consonants, it is important to note that in Common Greek the aspirated voiced consonants had become aspirated voiceless consonants, and that the labiovelars, judging by Mycenaean, were still preserved: thus Common Greek had three series of plosives (voiceless, aspirated voiceless and unaspirated voiced), with four points of articulation: labial, dental, guttural and labiovelar. But the appendix of the laryngeals was lost in certain contexts.

The *s* was preserved in groups and final position, but it became aspirated *h* in initial and intervocalic position (lexical borrowings and the evolution of certain groups later enabled the later acceptance of *s* in these positions). Yet, it is possible that certain later evolutions,

such as that of *-ti*> *-si* and that of certain groups with *s* and *y*, had already begun. In other words, the phonological system looked like this:

Vowels:	ă, ĕ, ŏ, ĭ, ŭ, ā, ē, ī, ō, ū
Sonants:	y, w, r, l, m, n
Consonants:	b, p, ph
	d, t, th
	g, k, kh
	g^w, k^w, k^wh
Sibilants:	s
Aspirates:	h

34. Morphology displayed the following characteristics, sometimes in combination with other languages: **-s* in the N. masc. sg. of the stems in **-ā*; **-i* N. pl. of the nouns in **-e/o* and *-ā*; G. pl. in **-som* of these same stems in **-ā*; the D. pl. in **-si* (not **-su*) of the athematic nouns; declension into five cases and three numbers; the development and frequent use of stems in **-eu* and the limited representation of those in **-ē* and **-ō*; the convergence of the suffixes **-tero* and **-yos* in the comparative, and the creation of **-tato* in the superlative; the inflection of the pl. of personal pronouns on **-sme* and **us-sme*; the opposition of the pronouns ὅδε/οὗτος/ἐκεῖνος; the preservation of athematic – and the lack of semi-thematic – inflection of verbs; the suffixes *-sa-* in the aor., *-k-* in the perfect and the integration of **-ē* and **-thē-* in the pas. aor.; the loss of the desinence **-r*; the assignment of an infinitive to each stem and voice; etc.

One must also point out the existence of doublets, some of which have already been mentioned.

It should be stressed that Greek maintained the common characteristics of Indo-Greek, along with its own evolutions, such as: in general, the preservation of the significance of the root and the morphological use of accent and alternation; in the noun, the opposition (though not always) of masc. and fem. stems, and in the adjective of the positive, comparative and superlative; in the verb, the opposition of the four stems of the pres., aor., perf. and fut., and their association, in most cases, with the subj. and opt. moods and the participles (also, as mentioned, the infinitives); the quadrangular system of the desinences in the four stems, maintaining the middle ones having a passive value, although the passive is complemented with special forms (Greek, not Indian) in the aor. and fut.; and the system of three aspects.

35. So, Greek has a clear and coherent phonological system, as well as a clear and coherent system of interweaving categories and functions. The problem is the irregularity of the morphology: allomorphs, syncretism, amalgams, the primacy of irregularity on regular declensions and conjugations.

This constituted the essence of Greek, together with a syntactic system that, judging from Homer, was similar to that of Vedic and in which the moods preserved their own value in subordination. There was still no article and the resources of lexical derivation were still not as developed as they would be at a later stage (neither those of the transformation of noun into verb, adjective and adverb, nor the inverse), yet there was already a rich system of composition and derivation, which formed the base of the later system.

Indeed, together with its system of categories and functions, the development of a syntax of subordination and of a lexicon were the principal factors of progress in Greek, and those which contributed the most to its transformation into the universal linguistic model for all languages.

CHAPTER THREE

FROM COMMON GREEK TO THE DIALECTS OF THE SECOND MILLENNIUM

1. Variants within common Greek

36. A language, especially one that is spoken by nomadic tribes lacking a centralised organisation or written culture, is never absolutely uniform. I believe that, despite trends in the current bibliography, variants were already present in Common Greek. Indeed, it was in Common Greek that some of the characteristics of the later East Greek, which descended into Greece towards the year 2000, began to disseminate. These characteristics appear in Homer, Mycenaean and the later dialects (or at least some of them): for instance, *-si* for *-ti*, οἱ, αἱ in the pl. pronoun, σύ, εἰσί, -(σ)αν, etc. See § 69.

Yet, there is still the serious problem of whether these 'pan-oriental' characteristics were diffused in a part of CG outside Greece, or only in East Greek (EG) inside Greece, before the Dorians blocked communications; or perhaps only in a restricted part of EG inside or outside Greece.

Then there is the existence of archaisms in CG, although these could have been displaced within it, in any location. There is also the presence of doublets, from among which there was a tendency to choose: often, no doubt, within CG, other times in Greece, where the doublet was preserved in certain dialects while in others it was a choice.

37. But certain archaisms from some or all of the dialects of East Greek clearly come from Common Greek or part of it: Hom. Ζῆν, ἔφθιτο, δάμνα (with parallels in Lesb. and Myc.), τοί (also in Dor. and part of Aeol.), case in *-pi* or -φι (Myc., Hom., Thes.), G. in -οιο (Hom., Myc., traces in Thes.), patronymics in -ιος (Hom., Myc., Aeol.), desinence in -το(ι) (Myc., Arc.). In addition, there are archaisms in which the Mycenaean is accompanied, or not, by other dialects: the preservation of *-w-*, sometimes of *-y-* and of *-h-* descending from **-s-*. Indeed, these phonemes existed in CG and continued to exist in EG, whether inside or outside of Greece.

The archaisms did not establish the distinction, for they were also (at some point) present in the part that would become West Greek (WG). But their presence enabled innovations in a particular part of CG or in the later dialects.

It is clear that doublets, from among which the dialects would choose, existed in CG and certainly in the EG within Greece. It is difficult to distinguish between the two cases. They often represent an old and a new form that coexisted for a certain period (μετά/πεδά/ἐν/ἐνς, δάμνα/thematic forms) or various attempts to find something to mark a new category (ἄν/κε/κα, αἰ/εἰ/ἠ, μιν/νιν, -ναι/-μεν, etc.). They could also represent divergent analogical generalisations (aorists in -σ- and -ξ-, etc.) or phonetic results arising from different contexts, striving to become generalised (αρ/ορ); or even simple hesitations within IE (D. sg. **-ei/*-i*, 2nd sg. **-es/*-eis*). This was to be expected, see Adrados 1952 and 1998b.

These doublets were subsequently distributed within EG and WG (-μεν/μες, -σα-/-ξα- desinences in the verb), or within different dialects of EG, some accompanied at times by WG: the vocalisation αρ (Ion.-Att. and Dor.) /ορ (Aeol., Arc.-Cyp., Hom. and Myc. with fluctuations); athematic verbs (Myc., Aeol., at times Hom.) and thematic verbs (elsewhere, but also in Hom.), in the deverbatives; D. sg. **-ei* (Myc., traces in Hom.) / **-i* (other dialects); G. sg. -οιο/-οο (Hom. and elsewhere) / **-os* (identical to N., in Myc. and Cyp.); the pronouns μιν (Hom., Ion.) /νιν (Dor.), verbal desinences -ες (Cyp., Dor.) /-εις (other dialects); infinitive in -ναι (Hom., Ion.-At., Arc.-Cyp.) /-μεν (Hom., Aeol., Dor.); the conjunctions εἰ (Ion.-At., Arc.) /αἰ (Aeol., Dor.) /ἠ (Cyp., written Boeot. αἰ); the particle ἄν (Ion., Arc., Hom.) /κεν (Aeol.) /κα (only in Dor.); the preposition ἐν + Ac. (Arc.-Cyp., Thes., Boeot.) / + D. (other dialects); etc.

Sometimes, archaisms are only found in Myc.: the preservation of the groups *-pm-, -tm-*, of the pronoun *to-to*, etc. Or, we find only archaic doublets (or doublets consisting of an archaic form and a recent form, corresponding to the other dialects): *-or-* / *-ar-* (vocalisations of <**-r̥-*); the prepositions *o-pi* / *e-pi, me-ta* / *pe-da*; thematic and athematic verbal forms; D. sg. *-e (<-ei)* / **-i*; etc. Archaic forms may also be present in Myc. and other dialects: πτ- / π- (in Myc., Hom., Arc.-Cyp.). Sometimes, we find correspondences between Aeolic and the non-Greek dialects (the timbre of vocalisations, the athematic forms of deverbatives and denominatives).

38. In other words, both CG and EG contained certain fluctuations that would spread to the whole or part of EG. Also, both WG and EG (or part of it) would have to choose between these fluctuations, although it is difficult to give an exact date of when this occurred.

Moreover, as mentioned above (§ 36), some innovations in EG could have already taken place in CG, anticipating a future division between the two dialects. Those innovations in particular that appear in all or most of the EG dialects, which were separated by large intransitable Dorian wedges in archaic times, must come from an earlier period: either from CG or, at least, EG in Greece before the arrival of the Dorians (eg., the evolution of *-ti* > *-si*; the N. pl. of the demonstrative οἱ, αἱ; the personal σύ, etc.). Thus, at the most, it can be said that the diffusion of these innovations had already begun in CG.

Certainly, CG would have shown innovatory tendencies and lines of fracture in those places where a differentiation of dialectal areas was commencing between the later EG and WG (certain isoglosses did not coincide with this limit) or between the later EG dialects. With respect to these isoglosses, in many cases it is impossible to determine the extent to which they correspond to CG or EG, and to trace the dialects which began to differentiate themselves, and which in any case only became defined in Greece after the arrival of the Dorians, with the help of new innovations.

39. This is but a summary of the doctrine presented in Adrados 1976a and b, 1984a, 1998a and b (also 1990a on G. = N. in Myc. and Cyp. thematics and 1990b on the system of five cases in Myc., as well as in Gr. in general). Cf. also M. Meier-Brügger 1992, p. 67, on the differences in CG.

For my views on all this and its precedents, see my two works of 1998 already referred to, as well as the prologue to the reedition in 1997 of my book of 1952, *La Dialectología griega como fuente para el estudio de las migraciones indoeuropeas en Grecia*. In these works, I refer to the stance attributing all dialectal differentiation to the period after the Dorian invasion in Greece; it derives from the well-known works of W. Porzig 1954 and E. Risch 1955. I do not believe that this in any way prevents us from proposing the start of differentiation in CG and EG (inside or outside Greece), despite the criticism of the view that a dialectal fragmentation had occurred outside Greece (cf., among others, A. López Eire 1989a). It is typical that, for instance, J. L. García Ramón 1975, for example, considers Aeolic to be post-Mycenaean: in my opinion, on the other hand, it became defined at this time, but some features are of an earlier date. The methodological issues and, more specifically, the concepts of innovation and choice, are studied carefully in Adrados 1952 and 1998b.

On the critique of J. Chadwick's thesis, in which he denies there was ever a Dorian invasion, cf. among others, J. J. Moralejo 1977b, pp. 243–267; also Adrados 1998b.

2. From the arrival of the first Greek dialects (East Greek, EG) to the arrival of the Doric dialects (West Greek, WG)

The diffusion of the Greek dialects

40. We have discarded the idea that there were no Greek migrations and that everything occurred through simple cultural diffusion from Anatolia. Indeed, although this book is devoted to the study of the history of the Greek language, not the history of the Greeks from an archaeological perspective, it is important to fix the date of arrival of the first Greeks in Greece, as well as that of the last Greeks, the Dorians. Furthermore, it is necessary to fix the principal dates regarding the expansion of the Greeks and Dorians. A history of the Greek language would be badly served without this.

The main stages in the evolution of the Greek language can be established from this starting point: Greek in the second millennium, from the first entry of the Greeks, which is known to us (though imperfectly) by way of Mycenaean, Homer, and from the retrospective conclusions that can be drawn from the Greek dialects of the first mellennium; and the Greek dialect which penetrated at the end of the second millennium with the Dorians.

Then, we must examine the split of Greek into different dialects during the first millennium, the external diffusion of many of them and the unifying tendencies that, in a second phase, tended to bring these dialects closer together. We must also look at the creation, from here, of the literary dialects or languages of Greece, in which the unifying tendencies were also felt; and lastly, we must examine the final unification, from Attic – the so-called *koine* – which sealed the fate of the Greek language in the Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine and Modern periods.

41. The Greek language no doubt arrived in various waves from Macedonia and Epirus, in the transition from middle to ancient Helladic (or Minoan); that is, around the year 2000 BC, as stated

previously (although perhaps somewhat earlier). This ushered in the so-called Mycenaean period, of which more is known from 1620 BC onwards, which concluded with the Dorian invasion, from 1200 BC onwards. It is contemporaneous with or rather posterior to the destruction of cities and cultures throughout the East, from Ugarit to Greece itself as well as Crete. Only in Egypt was this invasion of the so-called 'Sea Peoples' successfully contained, due to Merneptah's efforts.

From the year 2000 BC onwards, Greece, by will of the Greeks, was assimilated into the Indo-European culture of the *kurgans*, with its tumuli tombs, maces and stone axes, ochre burials, and many other things. According to Sakellaríou, Balkanic populations related to the culture of 'old Europe' also entered with the Indo-European Greeks.

This is the moment in which the great Mycenaean kingdoms of Greece were created: above all, Mycenae, Thebes, Athens, Pylos and Knossos. It is unclear whether other Mycenaean settlements, such as those of Orchomenoi in Boeotia, Iolcos in Thessaly or Tiryns in Argolis consituted independent political units.

42. Nevertheless, at the outset, the military, economic and cultural dominion of Greece was in the hands of the Minoans of Crete, who exerted great influence on Mycenaean culture. Thera and Athens itself were, no doubt, what Sakellaríou refers to as 'satelite cultures'. Minoan remains have been found in Thera, and in ancient myth Athens figures as a vasall of Minos, the mythical king of Crete. However, the situation on this island changed after the earthquakes of around 1550 and the volcanic eruption of Thera of the same date. It was a terrible explosion, worse than that of the Krakatoa: the resulting wave or *tsunami* devastated the entire Aegean littoral.

The Mycenaeans on the continent came to possess the Cretan palaces and created a new culture, adapting, for example, Minoan script (Linear A, derived in turn from a hieroglyphic script) to the needs of the Greeks: in this way, Linear B was created. This was the great climax of power for the Mycenaeans: in Crete, with its centre in Knossos, and in Greece in the kingdoms mentioned, whose archives used this script of Cretan origin. There is evidence of Cretan influence in Pylos 150 years before the destruction of the palaces, and it can also be found on islands such as Cyprus and Rhodes. In addition, cultural elements from the East, which had influenced Crete, were also present among the Mycenaeans.

43. This is the phenomenon of Mycenaean expansion, the first Greek expansion. It also reached Cyrpus, as I have stated, where the Mycenaeans settled around 1400. Here, a Cypro-Minoan script had been created in the sixteenth century, similar to the Linear A of Crete and other islands, for an indigenous language known as Eteocyprian. Its use was continued in Amathus, where the indigenous population took refuge from the Mycenaeans and, subsequently, from the Dorians: it was maintained until the fourth century. Classical Cyprian syllabic script is derived from this script, and it is used for writing Greek from the eleventh to the third century BC.

A multitude of Mycenaean remains which date from the same period has been discovered in Cyprus and Rhodes; particularly in the cemeteries of Camirus and Ialysos, but let us remember the presence of a Rhodian hero in the *Iliad*; Tlepolemus.

We have knowledge of Mycenaean expansion in the whole of the Levant, where there is not only evidence of trade, but also of fixed trade settlements, especially in Miletus. Thus, apart from trade, there were also settlements and military campaigns. The royal correspondence of the Hittites and Ugarit attest to relations between the Ahhiyawa or Achaeans and the kingdoms of Asia, which sometimes asked them for help or made agreements with them. All this occurred during the reign of the Hittite king Suppiluliumas (1380–1340), then under Mursilis II and his son Muwatallis (1306–1282) and under Tuthaliyas IV (1250–1220).

The Achaean princes, whose names are given on occasion (for example, Attarasiyas, or Atreus), carried out expeditions of pillage and were sometimes allied with the dissident kingdoms of the coast of Asia, such as Arzawa, in the southeastern limit of Asia Minor: this occurred during the decline of Hittite imperial power in the peripheral region along the shoreline.

Another expansion extended to the whole Mediterranean, including the Iberian peninsula, by means of trade and the establishment of *emporia*, such as that of Thapsus in Sicily.

44. On the arrival of the Greeks and Mycenaean expansion, see in addition to the bibliography previously cited, works by N. G. L. Hammond 1986b, p. 19 ff.; F. Schachermeyr 1980; M. Sakellariou 1980; F. Villar 1995, p. 289 ff.; J.-P. Olivier 1996. These works are also useful in relation to the great catastrophe of around 1200, the invasion of the 'Sea Peoples', which decimated the Mycenaean kingdoms (see also § 47), and in relation to the arrival of the Dorians. On the Ahhiyawa, cf. L. R. Palmer 1980, p. 67.

On Cyprus, see F. R. Willets 1988 and V. Karageorghis 1991, p. 76 ff. The royal correspondence of Egypt and the Hittites with the king of Alasia (Cyprus) refers to armed attacks from the continental peoples, cf. V. Karageorghis 1991, p. 82. On the Cyprian scripts, which include the Eteocyprian language (Cypro-Minoan script, from the sixteenth century), Greek (later Greek, from the eleventh century), cf. R. Schmitt 1977, p. 15 ff., Th. G Palaima 1991, Cl. Baurain 1991, M. Meier-Brügger 1992, p. 52 ff., A. Sacconi 1991: although it contains elements of the Cretan Linear A, Cypro-Minoan may proceed from Syria and especially Ugarit, where evidence of this has been found. On Crete, cf. C. Davaras 1976. On Cretan scripts see, in general, C. Brixhe 1991a and J.-P. Olivier 1996 (who identifies inscriptions which are dated earlier and later than the bulk of these, in the thirteenth century); on the Phaestus disk (Cretan hieroglyphics), see Y. Duhoux 1977; for Eteocretan, see Y. Duhoux 1982.

On Rhodes, cf. Ch. Karoussos 1973. On Asia, apart from Fernández-Galiano 1984, J. Boardman 1973, p. 41 ff., and the excellent revision of the later bibliography by V. Alonso Troncoso 1994. Also, E. Akurgal 1985, p. 206 ff.; and my article Adrados 1992b. With regard to the West, I have provided a bibliography in my article 'Navegaciones del siglo VIII, navegaciones micénicas y navegaciones en la *Odisea*' (1998c).

45. The forced expansive movement would certainly have had linguistic implications, so that Greek would have been spoken and understood in these settlements. In Crete and Cyprus we can trace its expansion from the end of the second millennium, as in Greece itself, although in Homer, as we shall see, traces of non-Greek populations remain.

Greek was certainly spoken in Miletus and other parts, where the Greek dialects became established again in the eleventh century, during the Mycenaean period. Indeed, we are told in the *Illiad* (VI 168 ff.) how Prœtus, king of Ephyra in Argolis, sent the hero Bellerophon to the king of the Lycians with a letter containing instrucions to kill the messenger. This letter is described as a dyptich of tablets (made of wood, no doubt) containing Mycenaean signs in Greek, and it is significant that the king of Lycia had no problems understanding it. Also, there do not appear to have been any linguistic difficulties among the Ahhiyawa and the Eastern princes or among Greeks and Trojans.

For this period, there is archaeological evidence of the diffusion of Mycenaean ceramics throughout the Mediterranean, even in Spain, in the Guadalquivir valley; other Greek cultural influences are also attested, along with, inversely, the Asiatic influence in Greece. But there is no data on Greek outside of Greece itself, except for the

Mycenaean tablets of Knossos and traces of second-millennium Greek in the epic that flourished along the Asian coasts in the beginning of the first millennium.

Greek in the second millennium

46. Our knowledge of Greek during the second millennium is scarce for a number of reasons. On the one hand, there was an oral poetic tradition which was recorded in writing only much later, in the eighth century, mixed with several adventitious and recent elements, and greatly altered, so that it is difficult to isolate the linguistic elements of the second millennium. Linear B could serve somewhat as a complement, but it was only used in the palaces, where it had an administrative function, apart from the marks on oil jars and such like; as we shall see, it was a standardised language, with hardly any differences. These inscriptions provide only partial evidence of second-millennium Greek. Moreover, their interpretation is often difficult and controversial due to the fact that the writing adapted badly to the Greek language, and due to our deficient understanding of the cultural context. In contrast, the tablets, evidently organised after the model of the eastern palaces and their archives, do not contain literary texts as those of the palaces did. The tablets were not baked, and were only preserved because of the fire that destroyed the palaces at some point during the end of the thirteenth century.

As far as we know, it was only in Cyprus that this script produced something approximating a close derivative. The hypothesis attributing the origin of the Iberian semi-alphabet to a syllabary related to that of this script, is almost forgotten today. Even if it were true, it cannot be denied that the later Greek alphabetic script had a very strong influence. The strong influence of the Greek language outside of Greece cannot be detected until the later period. It is not even easy to provide an image of second-millennium Greek in Greece.

Finally, when it comes to reconstructing second-millennium Greek, the conclusions obtained from the comparative study of dialects from the first millennium are not entirely reliable. However, I will refer to them to some extent. But the situation is as follows: the language or languages spoken in the second millennium were not written down. The sung or recited language of the *aoidoi* was written down much later and was much altered; the written language was reserved for very limited administrative purposes and possibly was not spoken.

47. It is important first to establish the historical background before dealing with the linguistic issue in more detail. I would like to emphasise the implications of the pillage, destruction and migrations caused by the 'Sea Peoples'. They brought a series of warrior peoples to Egypt around 1200 BC which are cited in Egyptian texts: the names are often interpreted as referring to the Lycians, Sardinians, Danaans, Dardanians, Cilicians, Tyrsenians, Achaeans and Philistines, among others. To the west they brought the Sardinians and, I believe, the Etruscans, who in my view are an Indo-European people from Asia Minor, and perhaps also the Elymi, who settled in Sicily.

After the last Greek offensive in Asia, that of the Trojan War, the Sea Peoples brought about the destruction of the Mycenaean cities in Greece itself, and in Crete and Cyprus they interrupted, for an indefinite period, trade and relations with the West: this is the so-called dark age. But that is not all: this vast commotion is linked with the destruction of Hattusas (today Bogazkoi) and the entire Hittite empire, which is attributed to the Phrygians: thus, there were great movements of peoples. Perhaps one of these peoples, also Indo-European, were the Armenians.

However, Ugarit and other cities of Asia were also destroyed, such as Mersin, Tarsus and Sidon, and the Philistines advanced, occupying the area which still today is named after them: Palestine. As we anticipated and shall soon see, the fall of the Mycenaean kingdoms is related to the Dorian invasion, which in turn is related to the emigration of different Greek populations to Asia Minor, Cyprus and Rhodes.

48. See, in general, works such as those previously cited by Hammond (p. 51 ff.) and Villar (p. 296 ff.), along with specialised bibliography such as T. B. L. Webster 1958, p. 136 ff., H. Stubbings 1975, Ch. G. Starr 1964, M. Marazzi 1985, the book *Traffici micenei*... (ed. By M. Marazzi and others, 1986), a colloquium in the French School of Rome (AA. VV. 1995), etc. On Etruscan as an Anatolian language transported into Italy (in opposition to the thesis of M. Pallottino and others attributing to it an indigenous origin in Italy), cf. Adrados 1989c, 1994c and 2005. On the Elymi, see R. Ambrosini 1983 (among other publications) and St. di Vido 1997.

49. Although syllabic script died out, the Cyprian syllabary, destined to record the Greek language, survived from the eleventh to the third centuries. Apart from this, there would be no other way of recording Greek in writing until the ninth or eighth century, this time with the aid of the alphabet, or alphabets rather, created from

Phœnecian, which is often related to the cuneiforme Ugaritic alphabet, which inherited a syllabic script. Thus, this detour had to be accepted, for in Greece there was no continuous evolution from the syllabary to the alphabet, as there had been earlier in Asia; not even in Cyprus, which, however, created the new syllabary for the local Greek dialect, based on the previous one, related to Minoan Linear A (which in turn inherited the hieroglyphic writing).

So, the Greeks had to adopt foreign systems of writing twice. But they did manage to perfect the alphabet, making it a vehicle of their literature and exporting it to many different peoples, who, modifying it, created their own alphabets and learned to write. This is how the Greeks contributed in this particular context. I shall return to this later.

50. On the history of these syllabaries, cf. J. Chadwick 1962, p. 17 ff. On Ugarit, cf. J. L. Cunchillos–J. A. Zamora 1995, p. 15 ff.; A. Curtis 1985, p. 27 ff. The fifteenth century is usually accepted as the date of the Cretan tablets in Linear B (all from Knossos). L. R. Palmer has fixed this date later, in the thirteenth century, the date of those from Greece, but this has received little acceptance; the fourteenth century has also been proposed. For J.-P. Olivier there are many possible dates, as has been mentioned. I refer to the origin of the alphabet in §§ 100 ff.
Cf. J. Maluquer de Motes 1968, and J. de Hoz 1969 on the cited hypothesis regarding Iberian script. See in this same article, hypotheses regarding the influence of the eastern syllabaries on other Mediterranean scripts.

51. The Mycenaean syllabary throws some light on second-millennium Greek, but it only allows for a limited understanding of the facts already discussed regarding its standardisation and its solely bureaucratic use. Literature was oral: it was recorded in writing only from the eighth century onwards, after the introduction of the alphabet. But it is debated to what extent this new epic and lyric inherited the language of the Mycenaean period and to what extent it innovated. Thus, the reconstruction of second-millennium Greek (or Greek dialects) is a difficult task, which involves combining data from Mycenaean, Homer (eliminating the later elements) and extrapolations from the Greek dialects of the first millennium.

52. On Homer and Mycenae cf., among others, T. B. L. Webster 1958, C. Brillante 1986 and J. Chadwick 1990; on Mycenaean culture in general, J. T. Hooker 197, J. Chadwick 1976, O. Dickinson 1977 and 1995, W. Taylour 1983; etc. On possible Mycenaean traces in lyric, C. Trümpy 1986 and C. Brillante 1987. On the reconstruction of second-millennium Greek, see §§ 68 ff.

The arrival of the Dorians

53. Before attempting this reconstruction, we must examine the events of the end of the second millennium – the arrival of the Dorians – as well as the linguistic scene which the Greeks encountered in Greece and which must have had an effect on their language.

The period of instability – in which palaces strengthened their fortifications and, as recorded on the *o-ka* tablets of Pylos, military units were deployed on the coast (events which are simultaneous with those in Ugarit and the campaigns of Ramses II and Merneptah in Egypt) – ended, as stated earlier, with the destruction and abandonment of the palaces, which were at some point occupied by the Dorians.

The arrival of the Dorians is mentioned by the ancient historians, especially Herodotus I 56, and also in the myth of the return of the Heraclides, or sons of Heracles. For a long time, nobody has doubted the fact that the Dorian invasion was the cause behind the destruction of Mycenaean culture, and this is still the most widely held view. However, it is suggested that, once the Mycenaean palaces had been destroyed by the invasions of the 'Sea Peoples' and their society had been disrupted, the Greeks who had remained behind in Macedonia and Albania, the Dorians, would in turn have found it easier to realise their own incursions of pillage.

But it would not be so easy for them, given that the same legend refers to resistance in different parts. Indeed, all the sources insist that the Dorians did not succeed in conquering Attica, where numerous refugees had settled, or the islands of the Aegean and other places.

54. The same geography allows us to see how the Dorians came from the N. and W., and were stopped in Attica and the islands; they surrounded the Peloponnese, unable to penetrate its centre, Arcadia, but being able to break the connection between the dialect of the latter and that of Cyprus, whose Mycenaean population evidently departed from the coast of the Peloponnese before the arrival of the Dorians. In any light, the Dorian conquest of Melos, Crete, Rhodes, Cos and the coast of Asia Minor around Halicarnassus and Cnidus took place later on. Historic tradition and archaeological data support this.

We must accept the fact that Attica – 'the most ancient land of Ionia', according to Solon (4.2), a region which had prospered and

developed after the fall of Mycenae, as demonstrated by its remarkable geometric ceramics – took in a considerable number of refugees. The Ionic colonies of Asia, dated usually in the eleventh century, were founded from here. In the same way, new waves of Mycenaeans moved to Cyprus from the Peloponnese before the Dorians occupied its shores: there is a bronze brooch from the eleventh century with a Greek inscription in the Cyprian syllabary which reads *O-pe-le-ta-o* '(I am) of Opheltes'. In addition, Lesbos was colonised from the continent, as stated by Thucydides III 2.3.

55. In conclusion, we must embrace the fact that the Dorians and the related people known as 'Dorians from the N. W.', descended from the N., taking advantage of the collapse of the Mycenaean kingdoms: they were, in effect, Greeks who had remained behind after the invasion, and led a pastoral existence in the mountains. They had an archaic Greek dialect, which had remained immune from the innovations of 'East Greek' which had entered Greece from the year 2000 and from which Mycenaean, the language of Homer, and the different dialects emerged. This dialect coincides with these as far as archaisms are concerned, but not as regards innovations.

Yet, there were no vacant lands in Greece, so the Dorians had to superimpose themselves onto the ancient Greek settlements, substituting their dialects – although traces of these remained at times, especially in Crete – or creating mixed dialects in Boeotia and Thessaly. By stepping in and driving wedges between the old dialects, some of which had been transported to the other side of the sea, the Dorians contributed to the isolation of the settlements and, in short, to dialectal differentiation, which is not attested (perhaps for a simple lack of data) in either Mycenaean or the Achaean epic of the poets. Many years must have passed before the unifying tendencies re-emerged.

56. As we know, on the basis of a well-known work by J. Chadwick 1973 (see also Chadwick 1985), a kind of scepticism has taken root in the academic world and for some time it has been trendy to deny the Dorian invasion. The Dorians are seen as a subjected people who rebelled against their Mycenaean masters, and Doric is regarded as a type of Mycenaean. Elsewhere (Adrados 1998b), supported by other studies, I have made a complete refutation of this hypothesis. Cf. also J. J. Moralejo 1977 and P. G. van Soesbergen 1981 (the 'Dorian invasion' is seen as a secondary migration of a straggler part of the Greek migration). We have precise historical and archaeological data whereas Chadwick's linguistic arguments are

insignificant. Cf. among others A. López Eire 1984a R. A. Crossland 1985 and J. Méndez Dosuna 1985, p. 299 ff. See D. Musti 1985b on the way in which the arrival of the Dorians should be conceived. On the archaeological aspect of this matter, see F. Schachermeyr 1980, p. 240 ff., who links the Dorians to the ceramics of the 'circle of Buboshti' in Macedonia and distinguishes them from the Dorians of the N. W., who are placed further to the west. On the Ionic settlement in Attica, cf. the same author, p. 374 ff. On pre-Dorian (Achaean) remnants in Cretan Doric, cf. Y. Duhoux 1988.

3. Greek and the non-Greek languages in the second millennium

57. So, we see that the Greeks were established in Greece starting from the year 2000. From the first millennium onwards, when we are provided with evidence for establishing these events, Greece itself is completely Hellenised. However, there are very many non-Greek elements in its toponymy and lexicon.

Indeed, a series of Greek authors preserved the memory of non-Greek settlements of archaic date: they even indicate that non-Greek languages were still spoken in certain parts, especially in the periphery of Greece. The information is collected in P. Kretschmer 1946, p. 146 ff., and O. Hoffmann 1973, p. 25 ff. Homer refers to the Pelasgians in Argolis, Thessaly and Crete (*Iliad* II 681 ff., 843 ff.; *Odyssey* XIX 179 ff.), and the memory of the Pelasgians of the heroic period persisted. Herodotus I 56 refers to the Pelasgians as the first settlers of Greece in Thessaly, Attica and Arcadia, cf. also I 146, VII 94 s., VIII 44; he refers to traces of them in Placia and Scylace, near the Propontis. But Thucydides IV 109 also refers to the Tyrsenians of Athens and Lemnos, which Herodotus calls Pelasgians (VI 136 S.); he also mentions the Tyrsenians or Etruscans who moved from Lydia to Italy (I 94); nevertheless, Thucydides IV 109 distinguishes Pelasgian from Tyrsenian in the Athos peninsula. This is confirmed by the well-known Lemnos inscription, written in a language that is very close to Etruscan.

So, the Greeks would have been found in Greece together with these Pelasgians or Etruscans, who, with some exceptions, later only survived in marginal territories.

58. There are written accounts of Asian settlements in Greece in archaic times. Herodotus I 171, Strabo VII 322, 374, XIII 611,

Pausanias III 1, 1, VI 2, 4 and the historian Callisthenes (*FrGH* 124 *F* 25) write of the Pelasgian occupation of central Greece, Messenia, Leucas, Euboea and the Cyclades, as well as almost the whole of Ionia. Sometimes their name is considered to be synonymous with that of the Carians (of which there are still linguistic traces in Asia), or else they are seen as part of this group or as their vassals. In any case, Thucydides I 8 attests that the ancient tombs of Delos were of a Carian type; and Callisthenes mentions a Carian emigration to Greece.

These neolithic settlements must have left a mark on the Greek language, something which I shall address further on (§§ 62 ff.).

59. Besides this, there is archaeological evidence in neolithic Greece of settlements of a northern or 'European' origin, in Sesklo and Dimini (nude female figurines, certain kinds of ceramics including those with stripes, spiral and wavy line designs): see P. Kretschmer 1946, p. 151 ff., among others. There is also evidence of settlements of Asian origin (city planning and fortifications similar to those of Troy I and II, ceramics that make use of a varnish known as 'Urfirnis', the nude goddesses of Cycladic art).

It is interesting to note that in the peripheral regions we still come across non-Greek settlements in the historic period, living more or less in peace with the Greeks. Aside from the information provided by historians and the previously mentioned Lemnos inscription it suffices to recall the Cypro-Minoan script that from the sixteenth century onwards recorded an indigenous language; it continued to do so until the fourth century among an indigenous population that had sought refuge in Amathus from the new Mycenaean invasions at the end of the Trojan War (the myth mentions Teucer, founder of Salamis) and from the Dorians, who had arrived in the twelfth century and who did not succeed in imposing their language. The oldest Greek inscription – dating from the eleventh century, as previously mentioned – is written in a new syllabic script and in the Cyprian dialect, which is related to Arcadian.

Crete must also be mentioned, where the Mycenaeans and then the Dorians arrived: an island with a highly civilised pre-Greek population, as shown by the hieroglyphic and Linear A scripts. The *Odyssey* XIX 176 refers to the Eteo-Cretans: their language continued to be spoken until the third century BC in Praisos and Dreros, and from a certain point it began to be written in the Greek alphabet.

Also, we must not forget Asia, where one need only read Homer to appreciate just how many different peoples were embroiled in the turmoil of the Trojan War. But there is no record, in the second millennium, of the languages spoken by the peoples on the Asian coast, although there is evidence relating to Hittite and Luwian; only from the first millennium do we have knowledge of Thracian, Phrygian, Lycian, Carian, Neo-Hittite, etc.

60. We can be certain of the following: at the close of the second millennium, with the collapse of the Mycenaean kingdoms and the Dorian invasion, Greek dominated Greece itself, but it only partially occupied the outer region, in Cyprus, Crete and Lemnos, and it was certainly in a minority in Asia and other parts which had been reached by the Mycenaean expansion. In the N. it was limited by Illyrian and Thracian, in Asia by Phrygian. These were Indo-European peoples who had arrived in the Balkans at a later date, but who may at times have been dragged along by the Greeks: Thucydides II 29 and Strabo IX 25 refer to the Thracians and Phrygians.

Some problems are presented by Macedonian, which was implanted in a territory where the Greeks had settled before entering Greece. It was Hellenised and began to disappear from the fourth century BC. However, there is still some doubt as to whether it was an Indo-European language distinct from Greek, perhaps of the Indo-Greek group (such as Thracian or Phrygian), or whether it was a Greek dialect that was left behind.

Macedonian is only known to us through a few glosses that display certain characteristics, the principal being the conversion of voiced aspirated to unaspirated voiced, in contrast to the Greek aspirated voiceless (δάνος for θάνατος), as seen in Illyrian, Phrygian or Slavic, among other languages. Other characteristics coincide with the Greek dialects or with Illyrian or Phrygian. Furthermore, certain names, such as Parmenon or Berenice, are Greek, the latter having an altered pronunciation.

From this point on, it is generally believed that we are dealing with a language that is different from Greek. In fact, the Greeks considered the Macedonians to be barbaric, cf. Demosthenes IX 31. Yet ultimately, in the context of the debate about the Hellenism of Macedonia, Greek scholars have claimed the Hellenicity of its ancient language. Macedonian would be a Greek dialect that was left behind, a branch that stands in opposition to the language that advanced

towards Greece and gave rise to the first dialects considered to be Greek. It is difficult to come to a clear decision on this matter, given the scarcity of information available to us.

61. On Macedonian, after O. Hoffman 1906 see E. Schwyzer–A. Debrunner (1st ed.) 1939, p. 69 ff. The new pro-Hellenic position is presented by authors such as N. J. Kalleris 1954, B. Dasakalakis 1960, L. A. Giundin 1987, A. Panayotis 1992 and J. K. Probonas 1992. The interesting investigations of A. G. Tsopanakis 1993, which look for a Macedonian lexicon in Walachian dialects of Macedonia, do not resolve the problem. In any case, it is clear that the Greek that spread towards the S. left an empty space for this other language – a 'retarded' Greek or a different Indo-European language – to occupy, which only became Hellenised from the fourth century onwards.

Pre-Greek elements adopted by Greek

62. The fact is that most of the toponymy of Greece and the islands, not to mention the coast of Asia Minor, is not actually Greek. The same applies to part of the Greek lexicon, which sometimes displays the same kind of suffixation as the toponymy, and sometimes displays phonemes in positions that originally were not allowed in Greek.

A good part of these pre-Greek toponyms find parallels in Asia Minor. Let us examine them from various perspectives.

a) *Suffixation.* Nouns in -ηνός, -ήνη ('Αθάνα, Μυκῆναι, Πειράνα, Πριήνη, Μυτιλήνη, the Τυρσηνοί that emigrated to Italy); in -(σ)σός, -(τ)τός and its feminines and plurals (Λυκαβηττός, Κηφισσός, Λάρισσα, Παρνασσός, Ὑμηττός, etc.; in Crete Κνωσσός, 'Αμνι(σ)ός, Τυλισσός; in Asia Κολοσσαί, Τελμησσός, Μυκαλησσός, Τερμησσός, Ἁλικαρνασσός, Σαγαλασσός, Περγασή, Μύλασα, maybe Κορυκήσιον); in -νθός, -νθος (Κόρινθος, Πάρνης, -ηθος (Τίρυνς/-ινθος in Asia Ξάνθος)); -στός in Φαιστός is no doubt a variant; in -ανδα, -ινδα (perhaps related to the previous, only in Asia: 'Αλίνδα, 'Αλαβάνδα, 'Αρυκάνδα, Καλίνδα, Καρυάνδα, Λαβράνδα, Πίγινδα), also Ἄσπενδος; in -ρνα (Μύκαρνα in Aetolia; also in Asia: Σμύρνα; in Crete: Φαλασάρνα; in Cos: 'Αλασάρνα).
b) *Phonetics.* There are various cases of non-Greek phonetics: initial σ- (Σαγαλασσός, Σαλαμίς, Σάρδεις, Σίλλιον); the alternation of *spiritus lenis/asper* (but perhaps this has something to do with Greek transcription: Ἁλι/α-, 'Αλι/α-), the σ- and the lack thereof; the alternation of α/ι (examples previously cited),

ρ/λ (Τελμησσός/Τερμησσός), γ/κ, -σσ-/-σ-. This marks the start of a different phonetic system. It seems that certain suffixes previously took a κ- ('Αρυ-κ-άνδα, Ἁλι-κ-αρν-ασσός, Κουρυ-κ-ήσιον): the transcription of a laryngeal?

c) *Derivation.* Sometimes we come across two derivatives from the same root or one derived from another: with the roots Ἁλι/α-, Ἀλι/α-, in Πέργη/Πέργαμον/Πέρινθος/Περγασή, Κολοσσαί/Κολοφών, Μυκάλη/Μυκαλησσός, Κόρινθος, Κορυκήσιον, Παρνασσός/Πάρνης/Παρνών, etc. Sometimes there seems to be an accumulation of suffixes: Ἁλικ-αρν-ασσός, Μυκ-άλη/Μυκ-αλη-σσός (maybe the κ is phonetic, as I have said).

d) *Morphology.* There are masc., fem., and n., sg. and pl. forms which display Greek morphology. This may be something new or may just be covering something old.

e) *Roots.* We can deduce the existence of various roots, some corresponding to Greek, no doubt as a result of borrowings (although sometimes a common Indo-European origin can be postulated). For example, Ἀλι- and variants, καρυ- (cf. Gr. κάρυα?), κορ- (cf. Gr. κόρυς?), λαβρ- (Gr. λάβρυς), παρν-, περγ- (the root of Gr. πύργος?), τερμ-/τελμ- (cf. Celtic *Termes?*), σιδ- (Gr. σίδη), σμυρ- (in Σμύρνη, cf. Gr. σμύρνα?), φάσ- (cf. Φάσις, Φάσηλις), χαλκ- (in Χαλκηδών, Ξαλκίς, cf. Gr. Χαλκός). In addition, there are toponyms common to Greece and Asia which are neither Greek nor appear to be Indo-European: Ὄλυμπος, Θῆβαι).

As noted above, the most striking thing is that these formations are analogous or identical to those of theonyms such as Ἀθάνα, the goddess, or common nouns such as κυπάρισσος, 'the cypress', ἀσάμινθος, 'the bath', βόλινθος, 'wild bull', ἐρέβινθος, 'chickpea', etc. One must look for etymologies, in whatever sense, which are parallel to non-Indo-European Greek words such as θάλαμος, 'the bedroom', μέγαρον, 'living-room', φάλασσα, 'the sea', religious or poetic terms such as διθύραμβος, ἴαμβος, θρίαμβος, λαβύρινθος, βάκχος, etc.

Sometimes we find common terms with non-Greek etymology and phonetics, such as σῖτος, 'grain, wheat', σίδηρος, 'iron', σίδη, 'pomegranate', βασιλεύς, 'king'; or simply with a non-Greek etymology, such as λήκυθος, 'a vessel', κιθάρα, 'zither' and theonyms such as Ἀπόλλων, Ἄρτεμις, Κυβήβη, etc.

63. There are evidently three possibilities: (i) that these words were adopted in the Balkans from the culture of 'old Europe'; (ii) that they were adopted in Greece itself or in Asia; (iii) that they were a result of the cultural influence of peoples from the ancient East. It is not necessary to propose a unitary solution. Cultural elements such as the bath or Mediterranean plants could come from Greece, or sometimes more specifically from Crete (λαβύρινθος, Δίκτυννα); 'iron' could come from Asia Minor, where it was introduced; the name of Apollo seems to come from Lydia, and Cybele from Phrygia. Remote etymology is another matter.

64. Three theories come to light when we see beyond the details. For the first theory, this vocabulary is Indo-European but with 'Pelasgian' phonetic alterations different to those of Greek: a different evolution of the sonants would explain, for example, τύμβος (Gr. τάφος), a consonantal mutation would explain the forms in -ινθος (from *-nt-*, in ἀσάμινθος, with the preservation of *-s-* at the same time and satemisation, cf. Gr. ἄκμων), φαλλός (of **bhel-*), ταμίας (of **dom-*, with the alteration of the vowel at the same time), etc. This explains σῦς beside ὗς, Γόρτυς of **ghr̥dh, *ghordh* (cf. OSlav. **gordŭ* 'city', Phryg. *Manegordum* and the city of Gordium). For the second theory the terms are considered to be Hittite-Luwian or Anatolian, having emigrated to Greece before the arrival of the Greeks. The third theory postulates a substratum of non-Indo-European terms. I will refrain from adopting any position here.

65. On the 'Pelasgian' hypothesis see, among others, V. Georgiev 1941, A. J. van Windekens 1952, W. Merlingen 1955; and further information and bibliography in R. Hiersche 1970, p. 33 ff., M. Meier-Brügger 1992, p. 69 f. On the hypothesis of Minoan, Luwian, and the rest, A. Heubeck 191, L. R. Palmer 1958, G. Huxley 1961. On Semitic borrowings in Greek, some of them very old, see § 66 and O. Masson 1967; on Egyptian borrowings, see J. L. Fournet 1989.

66. Nevertheless, at least part of this vocabulary was already incorporated into Greek in the second millennium BC. The Mycenaean vocabulary contains theonyms such as the names of Artemis, Athena, Dionysus and Ilitia (*e-re-u-ti-ja*); phytonyms such as *ku-pa-ro* and *ko-ri-ja-da-no* (κύπειρος and κορίανδρον), *ku-pa-ri-so* (in a toponym); cultural words such as *si-to, da-pu-ri-to, a-sa-mi-to* and *qa-si-re-u*, 'grain', 'labyrinth', 'bath', and 'king'. Also, of course, toponyms such as, among those

described, *a-mi-ni-so* (Amnisos) and *ko-no-so* (Knossos) in Crete; and anthroponyms such as *a-ki-re-u* (Achilles). Not to mention words from the Semitic, such as 'gold' (*ku-ru-so*) or 'tunic' (*ki-to*), or from Egyptian, such as 'elephant' (*e-re-pa-*), or the group of 'old travelling' words discussed earlier which, no doubt, already existed in IE before entering the Greek dialects in Greece.

Homer represents, in many cases, a testimony concordant with Mycenaean: with regard to toponyms, anthroponyms and common names. Recall, for example, ἀσάμινθος, βασιλεύς, κυπάρισσος, σῖτος, σίδηρος. Of course, there are certain Mycenaean terms which are lacking in Homer, and in turn certain terms which are lacking in Mycenaean, for example, ἐρέβινθος, θάλασσα, μέγαρον; and in both sources words are missing which appear much later (for example, διθύραμβος in Archilochus, seventh century). This does not mean that none of them already existed in the second millennium, whatever their path of entry may have been.

Thus, pre-Greek etymology is not always certain, cf. for example, for Αἴας and Αἰακός, A. G. Tsopanakis 1979.

67. It is certain that during this period Greek adopted a new vocabulary of different origins in order to give name to new cultural circumstances, new gods, plants, animals, products, and metals. But even the names of ancient institutions were replaced by new names, whether Indo-European or not (βασιλεύς 'king', φυλή 'tribe', χαλκός 'bronze'). And of course, with the introduction of a new political and cultural system, new words were introduced, generally by derivation from the Greek (ἐκκλησία, ἄρχων, ἔφορος, βουλή, etc.).

The Greek vocabulary was fundamentally Indo-European; most important of all, its methods of derivation and composition were Indo-European. The additions from this period and the periods before and after, taken from other languages, are important culturally but not structurally. Indeed, this subject has never been systematically studied. The great development of the Greek vocabulary took place much later.

The morphological and syntactical borrowings from this period were of even less importance, perhaps even of no importance. There was no great advance in this respect from Common Greek to the beginning of the great development of the beginning of the seventh century. It was only later that Greek made a giant leap, becoming the international model for all languages. Up to this point it was

merely another Indo-European language that had arrived in a territory dominated culturally by Crete and Asia, although it did have a well-developed morphology, as explained, which enabled future advances.

CHAPTER FOUR

GREEK IN THE SECOND MILLENNIUM

1. East Greek

68. East Greek is sometimes referred to as southern Greek, but however it is called it represents the Greek that entered Greece around the year 2000 and left its mark in the second millennium, in Mycenaean and whatever is archaic in Homer. It was also the base from which the great eastern dialects of the first millennium would spring, that is, Arcado-Cyprian, Ionic, and Aeolic. At one point, until the arrival of the Dorians, it occupied a continuous geographical area extending from the S. of Macedonia to Lacedaemon, as well as to Crete, Cyprus, Rhodes, and to other islands and certain parts of Asia.

As I have stated, today it is thought that the principal innovations of Greek are of a more recent date, the first millennium, as opposed to the old view in which the three principal dialects were thought to have come from outside of Greece. Thus, we have Ionic-Attic features which are only half or partially achieved in certain places, for example the conversion of ᾱ into η, contractions and metathesis of quantity, *u* > *ü*, the treatment of the groups of *-s-* and sonants and of *-ss-*, *-ts-*, *-ty-*, or the loss of the digamma, etc.; Aeolic characteristics such as those resulting from the groups of *s* and sonants mentioned above, the D. pl. in -εσσι, the part. perf. in -ντ-, etc. (we consider others to be archaisms or choices); and others from Arc.-Cyp., as for example innovations such as ἐν > ἰν, -ο > -υ, assibilated labiovelar before ε, ι, ἀνα> ὀν or choices such as ὀνυ, ὀνι, ὀνε.

69. Despite this, I have insisted in my review of the book by García Ramón (Adrados 1979b) and elsewhere that other characteristics found in one or various of the dialects of the first millennium are really either innovations from the second millennium, or choices within doublets also from the second millennium: here and there, remnants of the archaic form or the form not chosen are often found. The presence of some of these characteristics in more than one dialect or in Mycenaean or Homer is a strong argument. Sometimes

only a few eastern dialects have maintained the archaism, or sometimes only one: Mycenaean, Homer, Cyprian, etc.

For instance, innovations like *-si*, but with traces of *-ti* (in Myc., Hom., Aeol., Pam.), or the 3rd secondary pl. in -(σ)αν (Ion.-At., Arc.-Cyp., Hom.), or even ἡμεῖς and ἦν and their uncontracted forms (Ion.-At., Hom.), or ἀπο > ἀπύ (Arc.-Cyp., Lesb., Pamph.), which go back to the second millennium. Indeed, also archaisms such as the patronymic -ιος (Aeol., Myc., Hom.) or forms of an old doublet: ἄν (but κε in Aeol. and Hom.), -αρ- (but -ορ- in Aeol., sometimes in Myc. and Hom., and a bit everywhere). Thus, as I mentioned previously, the three principal dialect groups became defined in the first millennium, in isolation, although many of their characteristics are of an earlier date.

Of course, some characteristics of EG go back much further, to CG: as in the oppositions mentioned, -μεν/-μες, -ξα-/-σα-, and no doubt many of the ones we have referred to, at least in their initial state. Other characteristics no doubt only go back to the period in which EG was in Greece: to be sure, its great diffusion and the political fragmentation of Greece into different kingdoms favoured dialectalisation.

70. It is difficult to establish exactly to what extent the first-millennium dialects were anticipated in CG or in EG. There are very different isoglosses which could be traced back to EG dialects, but which do not coincide. Further on, I will examine those of Myc. and Homer. However, there are also isoglosses linking Ion.-At. with Arc.-Cyp., and excluding Aeol. (-ναι, ἄν, εἰ, -(σ)αν, -τε etc.; but -αν is found in Aeol., and -τα is found in Attic); others link Arc.-Cyp. and Aeol., as shown by -ορ-, πέδα, ποτί, athematic verbs instead of the contracted ones, etc. On occasion, there is fragmentation: τέσσερες in Ion. and Arc. (but At. τέσσαρες seems to be analogical). Sometimes the correlation extends to Hom. or Myc., but it can also only affect one dialect (ξύν in At. and Myc., patronymic -ιος in Aeol., Myc., and Hom., -το(ι) in Myc. and Arc.-Cyp., -φι in Hom. and Thes., thematic G. sg. in *-o* in Myc. and Cyp., as I have proposed). There is ἐμίν in Dor. and Hom.; also, Pamphylian presents similarities with Myc. and Arc.-Cyp., cf. M. García Teijeiro 1984 and A. López Eire–A. Lillo 1982 and 1983. But what do we think about the previous extension of an archaism such as this, and of other monodialectal phenomena, such as the preservation of *-pm-, -tm-* in Myc., that of Ζῆν in Hom., that of the thematic G. *-o-ne* in Cyp.?

I will not repeat the facts that I have presented in so many other works, which sometimes are more significant (the innovations and choices) sometimes less (the archaisms). The truth is, it is difficult for us to establish today whether there existed a dialect later split in Ion.-At. and Arc-Cyp., to what extent these two groups became isolated, and how this development was related to Aeolic. But we will return to this matter.

71. The archaic characteristics of Myc., which were subsequently lost, must be attributed to EG; for example, the preservation of the labiovelars, solutions of the *rh* type for groups of liquids + *s* or *y*. We must account for the transition phase in which certain isoglosses became generalised in EG and WG, or part of these, as a result of contact with the WG which came to Greece towards the year 1200 (I stress this in §§ 127 ff.). All of this means that EG, according to the dates and locations, must have been markedly different from our current idea of Greek and its dialects.

Throughout the second millennium, within Greece, this EG would have undergone a double process: on the one hand, it became unified to a great extent; on the other hand, it became more differentiated. The contact with Doric contributed to both processes. This differentiation created a more or less germinal base dialect of Ion.-At. and Arc.-Cyp., with transitions to a germinal Aeolic too, which was later invaded by Doric isoglosses. Yet, this split was more or less completed, and there were other – partly different – dialects close by, which have left traces in Mycenaean and in Homer. But here and there, archaisms could have existed, later to be lost, hesitations where later doublets became simplified, innovations whose limits of diffusion later changed, etc. Also, of course, archaisms coexisted with so many later dialectal innovations.

72. On the recent character of the dialectal innovations, I would like to recall the works of W. Porzig 1954 and E. Risch 1955, to which one can add the works of A. López Eire 1989a and A. Negri 1982a and 1982b. The latter denies the dialectal units preceding or contemporaneous with Mycenaean. These, however, are supported in works such as Adrados 1995, Palmer 1980, p. 39, F. W. Householder 1972, p. 59 f., A. López Eire 1978b, A. López Eire and J. Méndez Dosuna 1971, A. Bartoněk 1979, 1991, 1996, etc. Today the identifications are refuted: Mycenaean is not seen as the direct ancestor of any dialect, cf., for example, E. Risch 1979, p. 97, and 1990 (on Cyprian). The subject of dialectal differentiation in the second millennium is examined more closely in the works cited and in § 39. Above all, see A. Morpurgo 1984b and hesitant positions in K. Strunk 1997, p. 143 ff.

2. Mycenaean as a Greek dialect of the second millennium

What kind of language is Mycenaean?

73. A description of Mycenaean, to add to the many, will not be attempted here: instead, we will examine those elements of Mycenaean that make some contribution to second-millennium Greek and to attempt to establish the position of Mycenaean within the latter. As mentioned earlier, Mycenaean was an administrative language, which presents important lacunae for those attempting a description of the Greek language. It is almost uniform from Knossos and Khania to Pylos, Thebes, Mycenae and Tyrins (the only places in which it has been preserved): although this uniformity is due more to the fact that it was an official language that did not reflect the linguistic differentiations of the real language. It was the administrative language of the palaces, not a language of the streets.

But it seems clear that the differences between the language of Pylos and that of Knossos are minimal, and that the proposals by Risch and others to distinguish a 'normal Mycenaean' and a 'special Mycenaean' must be rejected.

I believe that it was an error to focus on the history of Mycenaean from the perspective of the differences between the dialects of the first millennium in an attempt to establish which of these was related to it. However, common sense seems to be gaining ground and the need to identify Mycenaean with any of them appears to have disappeared. The fact is, the dialects of the second millennium cannot be interpreted in the light of the first-millennium dialects.

Indeed, Mycenaean contains linguistic elements preserved in the dialects of the eighth century and sp., but it does not exactly precede any of these dialects, which essentially derive from a later fragmentation of East Greek, although some of their characteristics already had a dialectal character in the second millennium. The subsequent introduction of West Greek was added, as well as the interaction of some dialects. All of this, of course, was alien to Mycenaean. There were also pan-dialectal innovations affecting a wide range of dialects.

But this much is evident: Mycenaean was first recorded in writing in Crete with the help of a syllabary derived from that used by the Minoan scribes. If scribes, too, of the Mycenaean palace of Knossos recorded the Greek language for the first time with the help of a Cretan syllabary, it seems logical that they would have used the Cretan dialect that was familiar to the palace administrators.

Mycenaean is the Greek dialect of Crete that was subsequently brought to the continent as an administrative language, in addition to writing; no doubt, the first copyists would have come from there.

Of course, it is neither a popular nor a literary language, filled as it is with standard phrases and administrative formulas, the perfect understanding of which would require an understanding of the cultural and economic context (which is not our case, since we must deduce this from the tablets). Even so, Mycenaean is an invaluable testimony of one of the dialects of Greece in the second millennium. And it is natural for a specialised language, whether administrative or literary, to have a particular geographical dialect as its base.

75. On Mycenaean as an administrative or bureaucratic language, cf. M. Lejeune 1968, M. Durante 1968 and A. Bartoněk 1996. The differences between Mycenaean from Knossos and Mycenaean from Pylos have been noted, yet they are minimal: cf. M. Lejeune 1976 and the bibliography in Adrados 1998b. I do not believe in the two dialects proposed by E. Risch, the 'normal' and the 'special' (E. Risch 1966, cf. also, among others, R. D. Woodward 1986), for they are based on mere hesitations or on doublets; and to consider 'special' Mycenaean as that corresponding to the supposed rebel Dorians is nothing but pure fantasy. See a bibliography and arguments in Adrados 1998b and C. Consani 1989 (despite the administrative character of Mycenaean, there is 'affiorare sporadico' of some forms of the spoken language), C. J. Ruijgh 1996, K. Strunk 1997, p. 137 ff. and recently A. Bartoněk 2003.

Indeed, Mycenaean displays some slight variants (*-e* and *-i* in the D. sg., *a* and *o* as vocalisations of <*n̥*>, etc.), which is normal: it was, after all, a living language, which grew through variants and innovations. This provides even less justification for its interpretation as a 'mixed' language, as proposed by Georgiev 1964 (and also A. Negri 1981 and, if I understand him correctly, A. Bartoněk 1987).

On the Cretan origin of Mycenaean cf. some clarifications in J. P. Oliver 1996.

On the proposals attributing Mycenaean to a particular dialectal group of the first millennium, generally to Ionic-Attic, a bibliography has already been provided in § 72. But what the first-millennium dialects do display are isoglosses of various extension: whether in the whole of the Southern EG or only in Arc.-Cyp. (and sometimes Pamph., cf. M. García Teijeiro 1984) or Ion.-At., often reaching some part of Aeol. (for example, there is correspondence with Lesbian in κο-, ὄττις (ὅττις), -σμε, cf. A. López Eire 1987b). However, there are rarely any common innovations (cf. nevertheless E. Risch 1991, p. 233), most often we are dealing with archaisms and choices (sometimes of a recent date, common to WG). I must stress that the association of Mycenaean with a certain group is more that doubtful; see § 79. See also the bibliography in K. Strunk 1997, p. 143 ff.

With regard to its relation with Doric, as proposed by G. Rocca 1984, this is really a question of common archaisms. Furthermore, an inheritance of Mycenaean in the language of choral lyric, as proposed by C. Trümpy 1986, does not seem credible, cf. C. J. Ruijgh 1989, p. 85 ff.

For the study of Mycenaean archaisms, see my previously cited works, some of which deal with the vocalisation of the sonants, starting with my 1958 article (also A. Morpurgo 1968).

76. Before embarking on the study of Mycenaean from this perspective, two points need further attention. First is the fact that the Mycenaean graphic system contains ideograms and signs for numerals, weights, and measures in addition to the syllabary, and that it leaves many dark areas so that its interpretation is often controversial. There is no distinction between the quantities of the vowels, or between voiceless and voiced occlusives, while there are various syllabic signs with a doubtful interpretation. There are also problems and irregularities in the transcription of the consonantal groups; attention is hardly ever paid to final *-n*, *-r*, and *-s*. I even think that the mark of final diphthongs is asystematic, and in our transcriptions we are sometimes unsure whether a vowel is phonetic or graphic, etc. See, for example, M. Meier-Brügger 1992, p. 47 ff. Secondly, such incomplete texts with so many gaps simply serve to bring to our attention the presence of certain forms in Mycenaean. Many other forms are simply lacking, such as verbal, nominal, adverbial and lexical forms, so that we cannot draw a comparison with subsequent dialects or with Homer. We do not know whether its modal particle was *ke* or *an*, whether the conditional conjunction was *ei* or *ai*. We are ignorant with regard to the athematic infinitive, etc. Whole paradigms are missing. Indeed, statements such as 'Mycenaean has lost the augment', 'the article and demonstrative which preceded it are missing', etc., simply could be due to our lack of information.

77. On the characteristics of Mycenaean in relation to other dialects, see Adrados 1976a, 1984a and 1998b. Specifically, on the archaic system of five cases, see Adrados 1990b (regarding syncretism theory, cf. for example, H. Hettrich 1985).

From the perspective of the originality of Mycenaean, the facts presented in detail in these works suggest that, in the first place, Mycenaean is characterised by a series of archaisms that are peculiar to Mycenaean and that one supposes must come from CG or EG, as the case may be. They are either Indo-European archaisms or evolutionary stages anticipating the whole subsequent evolution.

In these archaisms, Mycenaean is either isolated from the Greek dialects we know, or else accompanied by some of them. But I insist that we must assume that these archaisms existed in all of the dialects at a certain point before the phase in which we know them.

Linguistic characteristics

78. Although no attempt has been made here to provide an exhaustive list, we can point out the following Indo-European archaisms in Mycenaean, whether isolated or accompanied by other dialects:

Phonetics: the preservation of the labiovelar series; partial preservation of *y*; lack of vowel contraction; preservation of the *-pm-*, *-tm-* groups; *pt-* beside *p-* (as in Hom. and Arc.-Cyp.). In the *s* + sonant, sonant + *s* and sonant + *y* groups, Mycenaean displays the beginnings of a solution with *h* or *ø* which precedes that of the later dialects, as I have proposed.

Noun: N. sg. in *-a* of the 1st. masc. decl. (uncertain); G. sg. in *-o* of the 2nd (= Cyp.; there is also **-o-yo* = Hom., Thes.); D.-L.-I. sg. *-e* < * *-ei* (= Hom., seldom; but there is also the common -i), pl. *-a-i* (< **-āsi*) (= Hom., Ion., archaic At.), *-oi* < **-oisi* (= Hom., archaic Ion. and archaic At.); a pure anumeric stem followed by an agglutinated particle (*po-pi*) (= Hom., Thes.).

Pronoun: the demonstratives *to-to* (= At.), *mi* (= Hom., Ion.), the reflexive *pei* (= Hom.).

Adjective: the patromymic in *-io* (= Hom., Aeol.), the numeral *e-me*, the comparative only in *-yo*.

Verb: athematic forms in *-ā*, (*te-re-ja*; there are also thematic forms) (= Hom., Aeol.), des. *-to*(*i*) (= Arc.-Cyp.); perf. part. in **-wosa: a-ra-ru-wo-a.*

Prepositions: *ku-su* (ξύν = Hom., archaic At.), *me-ta* (also. *pe-da* = Aeol., Arc.), *o-pi* (remnants in Ion.-At., also Thes.; *e-pi*, the common form, is also present), *pa-ro*.

Lexicon: among others, the words **owos*/ **owesos* 'ear', *i-ja-ro* (= Hom., Ion., etc. before the variant with *-e-*); *u-ju* (= *υἱύς); *de-re-u-ko,* that is, *δλεῦκος, γλ- in other dialects; *me-re-u-ro*, ἀλευρον in other dialects; abundant vocabulary, common to Hom. and sometimes other dialects, of the type *wa-na-ka* (ἄναξ), *i-ja-te* (ἰατήρ, also in Cyp.), etc.

79. All of these archaic elements, in certain cases, could have occupied all of CG and EG (or the latter, at least), or part of it. We

can see that, besides archaism, Mycenaean contained variants that were also present in other dialects. In some cases there are relative archaisms: G. *-o-yo,* which is IE, but here it was more recent than the N.-G. *-os*; and I would like to recall the sonant + *s* or *y* groups mentioned above.

So, none of this indicates a special relation between Mycenaean and any other dialect, even when Mycenaean preserves a doublet of Greek date: *o/a, or/ar* in the vocalisation of the sonants, or when it presents a choice: *-eus* and not *-ēs* (in nearly all of Greek, except for Arc.-Cyp.); G. in *-oyo* and not *-oo* (of *-osyo, in Hom. and Thes., as mentioned). Of course, this demands broad explanations, which I have provided in other works.

If what I say is correct, then these choices would also be of no use to us in classifying Mycenaean. In a period that predates our knowledge, the distribution could have been different.

The innovations remain. They are very rare: the creation of a secondary *yod* (*su-za* of συκέαι; there are close examples in Hom. and Cyp.); irregularities in the treatment of primary *yod* after the occlusive (*ka-zo-e* < *kakyoses*); the dual *to-pe-zo*; the loss of augment.

80. Thus, Mycenaean was an extremely conservative dialect, with hardly any innovations of its own, although with a few choices, it is true, in common or not with other dialects. It preserved its archaic forms in a time when all or part of these other dialects had either lost them or had chosen from among the doublets: this is the most remarkable thing. We cannot establish its exact relation to the para-Mycenaean dialects, apart from the fact that it is more archaic and proceeds in an original way with some choices and innovations. Yet, the picture is incomplete without a study of its relation to the Homeric dialect.

Before turning to this, the impression we get is that Mycenaean, a bureaucratic form of the Cretan dialect predating the tablets from the continent, maintained an archaism that, no doubt, was absent in the spoken language. This would have contained variants (what we have referred to as para-Mycenaean dialects) which presaged the future dialects of the first millennium. An official, archaic language of remote origin and antiquity would have co-existed with the spoken dialects, somewhat like the co-existence of Latin with the germinal Romance languages at the start of the Middle Ages.

3. Achaean epic as a Greek language of the second millennium

Diverse theories on the Homeric language

81. There is a second source for the knowledge of Greek in the second millennium: the epic language of Homer and his succesors. The problem is that this language reached its definitive form through Homer's writing of it (directly or by dictation) in the eighth century BC. Moreover, as it is universally agreed, it was an artificial language that was renovated in the mouths of the *aoidoí* from the second millennium on, and even earlier, from CG and certainly from IE.

The Indo-European epic has similar characteristics: it mixes old and recent linguistic forms, and old and recent historical data. This occurs within a formulaic system that comes from the Indo-European epic and that reinforces a partly artificial language by using doublets and other artifices. It is, in effect, a system of formulas and standard phrases within fixed metrical schemes: it may admit different forms or it may adapt them to the linguistic evolution; or, in contrast, it may modify the formulas and create new ones.

82. K. Witte 1913 and K. Meister 1921 studied the formulaic and artificial character of the Homeric language. After this, M. Parry 1928 studied the formulaic system, and a clear presentation of the subject is provided by A. Parry 1971. I would like to distinguish J. B. Hainsworth 1968 and A. Hoekstra 1969a among the later works that explain how the formulas modified and adapted themselves to the evolution of the language. The study of formulaic diction in Serbian poetry began from the study of Homer, and was undertaken by A. B. Lord 1960. A general picture of formulaic diction in the epic of different Indo-European languages is provided in Adrados 1986d.

These studies show that the Homeric formulaic system, despite being modified at the end of the Mycenaean age, descends from Mycenaean and from Indo-European. So, in the second millennium we can also postulate general characteristics of the language of the Greek epic that are similar to those known to us through its renovation, its admission of doublets, etc. It definitely remains a literary language, whatever the geographic base. See also A. Heubeck 1981.

Furthermore, see the following works on the general characteristics of epic poetry, which are reflected in Homer: H. M. Chadwick 1967 and (in collaboration) 1968, and C. M. Bowra 1952; also, Adrados 1986d and 1992b.

83. Thus, the problem is to distinguish what is ancient from what is recent in the Homeric language: what comes from the second mil-

lennium and from the first millennium, that is, from the dialects of the latter (Aeolic, Ionic-Attic, and according to some, also Arcado-Cyprian). It is not an easy distinction to make. The fact is that the language of the second millennium, which no doubt had its own geographic base (but not the same as Mycenaean, judging from the discrepancies between them), later on received various additions from the different generations of *aoidoí* in an age in which the dialects known to us already existed. The formulaic system adapted to the new needs and admitted this new linguistic material.

The Homeric language did not yet exist in the form in which we know it in the second millennium. Indeed, it is very clear that Ionic elements such as η instead of ᾱ, and Aeolic elements such as ἄμμε, κεκληγόντες belonged to recent strata of Greek, of the first millennium. However, it has never occurred to anyone that certain forms that could actually be Doric, such as τοι or the inf. in -μεν, were in fact Doric: they are simply passed off as being archaisms.

Not even a form such as θεᾱ́ is considered to be Attic: it is simply regarded as another archaism. In Homer there are no innovated Doric forms of the type ἐμέος, nor innovated Attic forms such as ἀποτινέτωσαν. For this reason, the interpretation of the Homeric language as a conglomerate of dialects of the first millennium is a colossal error of investigation, once we acknowledge the existence in this language of some simple archaisms (such as ἔφθιτο, ἆλτο, κέλσαι, πεφιδέσθαι, Ζῆν, or certain terms of the lexicon), and some artificial forms (verbal forms with *diectasis*, metrical extensions, etc.).

This reflects an uncritical continuation of the interpretations of the old grammarians, who in turn reflected the dialectal interpretation of the Greeks in general on the basis of the dialects they knew and not of the linguistic situation in the second millennium, which they of course ignored.

For instance, Homer occasionally preserved forms such as the archaisms just mentioned; and he preserved fluctuations which EG in general subsequently eliminated, such as -σσ/-σ- (without regular simplification), τοί/οἱ, τύνη/σύ. Homer also preserved doublets that had been eliminated even from Mycenaean, as noted earlier (ξύν/σύν, etc.).

84. The traditional theory is that a first 'Aeolic' phase was succeeded by a second 'Ionic' phase. Beside elements from the first millennium, which were clearly Aeolic and Ionic, elements from the second

millennium, which cannot be considered Aeolic or Ionic, were considered as belonging to their dialects. The same goes for the so-called Achaean (or rather, Arcado-Cyprian) elements, which other authors consider to be earlier than the former: these elements tend to be simple archaisms, nearly always of a lexical type (αἶσα, δῶμα, ἄναξ, etc.); cf. R. Hiersche 1970, p. 90.

According to this theory, a generation of 'Achaean' *aoidoí* would have been followed by another generation of 'Aeolic' *aoidoí*, and this by a third generation of 'Ionic' *aoidoí*. Hardly anything is said about archaisms, nothing at all about Doricisms or about artificial forms, except to attribute them to very recent phases. Apart from that, there can be no doubt whatsoever about the artificial character of the Homeric language, its capacity to choose or create forms according to metre, etc.

Our view of the Homeric language

85. The key problem is that certain characteristics that were, for instance, Ionic or Aeolic in the first millennium, were not yet so in the second millennium before the dialects we know were shaped. In Homer, there is *-ti*, an archaism, and *-si*, East Greek in general; there is -αρ- and -ορ-, ἄν and κε, which co-existed, they were not yet 'Ionic' and 'Aeolic', in the same way that ξύν and σύν were not yet 'Attic' and 'Ionic' and πτ- was not 'Achaean' but simply an archaism. In addition, characteristics that began to spread – such as -σαν in the 3rd sec. pl., which later became Ionic (but there is -αν in Arcadian) – were innovations which had success in certain dialects, for they were not yet marked dialectally in any sense. Others, such as the D. pl. -εσσι, never even had the chance to assign themselves to any one dialect.

We only know of other forms through Mycenaean or Homer himself: there is no reason to assign them to the dialects of the first millennium. Indeed, if certain words are present in Homer and Arcado-Cyprian or Mycenaean, for example, then this means that they also existed in some part of EG from the second millennium. If -φι is present in Thessalian, this only means that it existed in the second millennium (Mycenaean is another witness), etc.

Of course, we must also attribute to the Greek of that period the labiovelars, not their later evolutions, the ϝ, the vowels in hiatus without contraction, the groups of *s* and sonant, and inversely (cf. Hom.

τέλσον), or of sonant and *y* (or a phase with *h* still partially preserved in Mycenaean) and not their later evolutions in Ionic or Aeolic.

In other words, the supposed archaic 'Ionicisms', 'Aeolicisms', etc. of Homer (later, true Ionicisms and Aeolicisms were introduced), were simply forms that would later become part of these dialects, as I explain in Adrados 1981. According to Hooker 1983, the epic language should be studied without 'dialectal preconceptions': the concepts of 'Ionic' and 'Aeolic' are inadequate, as demonstrated by τοί which does not fit into the system. Chadwick himself (1990) acknowledges that 'the four main dialectal groups cannot be projected onto the second millennium'.

86. The fact is, certain Homeric characteristics descend, indeed, from the dialects of the first millennium, that is, from Ionic and Aeolic, in whose sphere epic poetry continued to grow (perhaps in the region of Asia in which they crossed paths, as proposed by Wilamowitz; cf. also C. J. Ruijgh 1995–96). But it is a mistake to assign a dialectal label of the first millennium to archaic Homeric characteristics, from a period in which these dialects did not exist. It is true that these characteristics were understood in this way: ἄν, ναι were understood by later Greeks as Ionicisms; κε, -μεν as Aeolicisms, and modern linguists continued this tradition in error. But they did not know what to make of τοί or θεά whereas the reconstructed digamma or the patronymic in -ιος, simple archaisms, were attributed to Aeolic. They also called αρ forms Ionic, and ορ forms Aeolic. Furthermore, the δε- solution of *g^{w}e- was considered Ionic, and the βε- solution Aeolic: this is correct, but they are referring to recent transcriptions of ancient *g^{w}e-, as ἡμ- and ἀμμ- are recent transcriptions of <*n̥sm>, etc.

Thus, certain archaic forms or the characteristics of certain archaic dialects were secondarily interpreted as Ionic or Aeolic, for the simple reason that they were Ionic or Aeolic in the eighth century and later on were always interpreted so; they attracted recent Ionicisms and Aeolicisms to the epic language, which was always in a state of evolution. In the same way, the presumed 'Achaeanisms' of Homer, that is, certain morphological and lexical coincidences with Arcado-Cyprian, are simply archaisms; but these did not attract recent archaic forms, it was a non-literary dialect neglected by the *aoidoí.*

87. On the ancient grammarians' view of the dialects, see J. B. Hainsworth 1967; also G. Scarpat 1952, R. Hiersche 1970, p. 80 (with a quote by Dio Chrysostomus XI 23), and C. Consani 1993.

On the bibliography of the traditional interpretations of the Homeric language, see, for example, R. Hiersche 1972 and Adrados 1981, p. 13; a standard presentation can be found, for example, in the *Grammaire Homérique* by P. Chantraine 1942. The truth is, there has been no real progress since then. On the polemic surrounding the existence of Aeolicisms, or the lack thereof, cf. K. Strunk 1957, A. Wathelet 1970, as well as M. Durante 1968, G. C. Horrocks 1987. R. Hiersche 1970, p. 83 ff., is sceptical about a large series of proposed Aeolicims (-ορ-, υ < ϝ, -εσσι, ζα- which he regards as only 'passing for' Aeolicisms). On a possible, older layer of Achaean archaisms (based on Arc.-Cyp.), cf. C. J. Ruijgh 1957 and later works (against this, M. Peters 1986); on possible Myceaneanisms, J. Chadwick and G. P. Shipp in G. S. Kird (ed.) 1964. Shipp opposes Chadwick in the same volume by doubting the Mycenaeanisms, which to him are archaisms. Cf. also in the same vein, R. Lazzeroni 1969. See another theory (a Palaeo-Aeolic stratum followed by an Arcado-Cyprian one) in A. Negri 1981b and C. Brillante 1986. On the 'non-Ionic elements without a clear definition' cf. R. Hirsche 1970, p. 91. Other studies include: C. J. Ruijgh 1984 and 1995–1996, B. Forssmann 1991, O. Panagl 1992.

The theory presented here is supported in Adrados 1976a (with much more detail regarding Achaean Epic) and 1981 (the theoretical foundation). These ideas are strongly supported by J. T. Hooker 1983 and also by J. Chadwick 1990 (without quoting me, perhaps by coincidence he arrived at the same conclusion); they are ignored by K. Strunk 1997, p. 149 f. Actually, they are an ineluctable consequence of the thesis of the recent character of most of the innovations of the dialects: the strange thing is that there is a continuous and routine repetition of the same ideas that were proposed when those dialects were projected onto the older date.

88. So, there was an epic language before the dialectal differentiation, at a time when the labiovelars were still preserved, there was no contraction of vowels, and archaisms and doublets, later reserved to certain dialects, survived. Indeed, the epic language favoured the existence of doublets, which had existed earlier in EG (although some were created artificially), but were maintained in places where the dialects tended later to choose between the two forms. For instance, οιο/-όο/-οῦ, αρ/ορ, -ναι/-μεν, ξύν/σύν/αἰ/εἰ (previously quoted), -τι/-σι (archaic and recent forms), -ᾱς/-ᾰ in the first declension, -λσ- (archaism) / forms with a lengthening of the vowel, forms with or without digamma, etc., normal or artificial forms, etc. All of this represented nothing but an exploitation of the variation between archaic and recent forms or among parallel forms (phonetic or otherwise) in EG.

I am not attempting a study of the Homeric language as it is represented in our manuscripts, but a study of its predecessor, the epic language of the second millennium. It coincides to a large extent with Mycenaean as to the archaisms (patronymics in -ιος, the form in -φι, the doublet αρ/ορ, etc.) and also with the archaisms that can be deduced from the study of the first-millennium dialects (τοί, τύ, etc.). However, it must be granted that, on occasion, this language (to the extent that it is known to us) has lost certain Mycenaean archaisms; or else has preserved doublets where Mycenaean had simplified in a different way. I have provided examples.

The Homeric language also had its own archaisms of the type Ζῆν, ἔφθιτο, τέλσον, etc. Sometimes, the lack of Mycenaean data allows us to establish a relation. But, on occasion, Mycenaean and Homeric archaism, or its choice, only spread to certain dialects: -εύς (-ε̄ς in Arc.-Cyp.), μετά (except for a group with πεδά in Arc.- and Lesb.), etc.; or else Homer (or 'our' Homer?) chose in accordance with all the dialects, against Myc. (D. sg. in -ι, with exception) or against Myc. and Arc.-Cyp. (verbal des. -ται). At times, archaism is preserved in an isolated dialect, against the rest, including Hom. and Myc. (D. sg. in Cyp. *-o-ne*).

Mycenaean archaisms such as the preservation of the labiovelars or the preservation of *h* proceeding from *s* have been lost in the epic language: but perhaps this is just something peculiar to 'our' Homer, not that of the second millennium.

With regard to innovations, apart from those that are clearly from the first millennium, Homer shares some (which are not in Mycenaean) with the southern group: -(σ)αν in Ion-At.-Arc.-Cyp., concordance with Ion., At., and Arc. in the treatment of the groups of *-ss-*, *-ts-* and *-ty-*, etc. Homer also has some innovations of his own, but these are not significant enough to establish dialectal relations.

89. In short, the ancient background of Homer's language comes from a conservative dialect of the second millennium which is not exactly Mycenaean, for its archaisms are partly different. As far as its choices and innovations are concerned, sometimes it follows nearly all of non-Mycenaean EG, sometimes it follows the Ion.-At.-Arc.-Cyp. group (against Mycenaean). But it preserves doublets identical to those of Myc., which the different dialects, including Aeolic, have simplified (at times in a contrasting way).

We cannot establish the geographical base of this language, nor to what extent an older epic language was renovated afterwards by various additions. We can only claim that it was an archaic language closely related to Mycenaean and to the language that is sometimes at the base of the whole of first-millennium EG, sometimes at the base of just a part of it (that is, to the para-Mycenaean dialects). The only thing left for us to do is to attempt to set aside those elements that were added to the epic language in the first millennium in the course of its evolution.

Achaean epic, an archaic language, no doubt comes from a different geographic area than Myceaean, which comes from Crete. It has been proposed that variants in this language left traces in Hesiod and lyric, see §§ 151 f.

It was an area in which a peculiar dialect of EG began to take shape, which did not take part in the tendency to differentiate pre-Ionic from pre-Aeolic. But, because the archaic forms and the doublets of this dialect often coincide with those of the later dialects, Ionic and Aeolic – or, to be more exact, Asian Ionic and Aeolic – the epic admitted forms of these dialects secondarily. Here, the epic language continued to evolve.

Thus, we know the Greek of the second millennium, directly, through a dialect that was brought from Crete to the continent in the second millennium with an administrative purpose; and through a dialect brought from a certain place to Asia as a poetic language in the first millennium (but which, perhaps, had been developing in Asia since the Mycenaean period).

However, we can also to a certain extent reconstruct what would have been the spoken language of the period: the para-Mycenaean dialects.

4. Para-Mycenaean in the second millennium

90. Thus, we have a very incomplete knowledge of Greek in the second millennium. On the one hand, we can draw some conclusions from CG and EG as to how much in them is unified and fragmented. On the other hand, we have a direct knowledge of an administrative language, Mycenaean, which provides us with lacunae and problems, and a reconstructed epic language that we can deduce from the epic language of the first millennium. Both languages definitely have very concrete geographical origins.

These archaic languages are of very special and reduced uses, and their relation to the spoken languages – the archaic forms of eastern dialects, which I call para-Mycenaean – is difficult to establish in any concrete way. Evidently, throughout the whole of Greece there must have been a spoken language that was beginning to fragment, just as the political power was fragmenting: some information about this has already been provided.

I would like to highlight certain views. None of the previously mentioned innovatory characteristics of Ion.-At. is present in the second millennium: they appear later. The same applies to those of Aeol. or Arc.-Cyp. The innovations that are common to all of them come from EG, as we have seen. Also, there are some archaisms of Ion.-At. (the prepositions without apocope) or of Attic (ξύν, πόλει).

None of this tells us much. But the series of choices common to Ion.-At. and Arc.-Cyp. are important: we can recall the examples of εἰ, τέσσερες, -ναι, ἄν, -τε, -αρ-, εἴκοσι, etc. They evidently go back very far, before these dialects were entirely constituted. It seems that there was a linguistic territory with common characteristics that extended from Attica to the Peloponnesus, by way of the Corinthian isthmus. The fact that there was not always complete unity (archaisms in Attic or Cyprian or remnants of divergent choices) does not undermine this argument. But I do believe it is possible to speak of a first hint of Ionic-Attic and even Arcado-Cyprian and Aeolic before the end of the Mycenaean period.

91. Sometimes, a characteristic that in principle corresponds to the complex formed by the later Ionic-Attic and Arcado-Cyprian dialects extends beyond these frontiers and is found in an Aeolic dialect: μετά in Thes., -(σ)αν in Boeot., and I have already touched upon those of Lesbian. But the opposite is more frequent: coincidence between Arcadian-Cyprian (or one of the two dialects) and Aeolic as a whole or part of it, always as regards choices: the pronouns ὄνυ, ὄνε, ὄνι, the prepositions πεδά, ποτί, the pronominal element -σμε.

In short, some (innovatory) isoglosses of the first-millennium dialects reflect something that was peculiar to EG as a whole; some (choices, archaisms) excluded the territory that later became Aeolic; some reached it in part; and some excluded the dominion of the later Ionic-Attic.

It must be stressed that a great differentiation did not exist. There were no great dialectal innovations. Here and there, archaisms and choices survived which were also present in distant territories. Indeed,

archaisms and doublets which were present in Homer and Mycenaean may have survived in Para-Mycenaean, or part of it, in contrast to what can be deduced from the later dialects. And there are problems with Aeolic: the doubt as to whether certain coincidences with Ionic-Attic are not an effect of a recent influence, as proposed by Porzig; whether certain coincidences of Boeotian and Thessalian with Doric were not an effect of the influence of the latter. If these two hypotheses were true, the dialectalisation of EG in the second millennium would be much clearer than we now think.

These problems will be discussed in the context of the study of the first-millennium dialects, which, as we have seen, deepened the dialectal differences after the arrival of the Dorians, who isolated the different territories: the territory of the Peloponnese (reduced to Arcadia and to the emigration to Cyprus), that of Attica (and its emigration to the islands and Asia), and that of Thessaly and Boeotia (with emigration to Asia and Lesbos). The later dialects correspond to these territories, which were Mycenaean kingdoms or groups of Mycenaean kingdoms. It appears that there was already a hint of them, to a certain extent. Various authors, including myself, have proposed this.

CHAPTER FIVE

GREEK IN THE FIRST MILLENNIUM: DIALECTAL PANORAMA

1. The expansion of the Greek dialects

The first expansion

92. I have specified the circumstances surrounding the fragmentation, in the first millennium, of the relatively unified East Greek that was spoken in Greece during the second millennium. This topic must be looked at more closely, but to do so it is useful first to examine the expansion of the Greek dialects from the arrival of the Dorians onwards, inside and outside Greece, and also to look at the diffusion of the alphabet and script.

To begin with, the Dorian invasion brought to Greece an archaic language lacking the innovations of East Greek, which had entered Greece towards the year 2000 and had Hellenised it during the second millennium. Apart from destroying the earlier culture, the invasion also isolated the three regions which had been spared during the invasion. These regions developed three dialects – Thessalian and Boeotian, Attic and Arcadian – which were later exported to Asia and the islands. In their fully developed state, these dialects became known as Aeolic, Ionic-Attic and Arcado-Cyprian.

Indeed, from the ninth century onwards, Greece began to reinvent itself. It developed a geometric and later oriental style of art. This was the age of the cities, of the great sanctuaries, commerce, and advances in architecture, sculpture, ceramics and painting. The aristocracies developed an international way of life, the alphabet was introduced and links were established among the eastern dialects and with Doric, which enabled the convergence of dialects and of Greek cultural forms, including oral and written literature. But this was to be expected, and it will be examined later on. First, I must emphasise the dialectal differentiation.

93. As I have explained, not so long ago it was customary in discussions on Greek dialectology to propose that the three great dialects

(apart from Doric) had entered Greece from the North in an already fully formed state around the year 2000. Kretschner and Tovar, among others, propagated this theory and I myself was not immune to it. But from the 1950s onwards, it became increasingly evident that the main innovations of these dialects should only be dated starting from the year 1200 BC (in 1952 I had stated that the innovations were essential in tracing the dialectal history). The relevant bibliography has been provided.

To be sure, some scholars have gone further, presenting Common Greek and second-millennium Greek as absolute units: this is unrealistic, as we have shown. Yet the great fragmentation occurred, in effect, after the year 1200.

94. This expansion of the Greek language was resumed, as we have seen, after the great catastrophe that was the destruction of the Mycenaean kingdoms around 1200; and, above all, from the ninth century onwards, when the Greeks, in rivalry with the Phoenicians, once more began to explore the Mediterranean, to trade there and to establish colonies. Different cities with different dialects intervened in these processes after the arrival of the Dorians.

Actually, the islands and the whole western coast of Asia Minor became a new Greece through the efforts of the Aeolians, Ionians and Dorians; even the southern coast between Lycia and Cilicia, Pamphylia. New 'contingents' of Greek dialects from the eastern groups became established in these parts and in Cyprus. Within Greece itself the Dorians occupied, as is well known, Phocis and the territories to the west; the whole area surrounding the Peloponnesus, from Corinth and Argolis to Elis and Messenia; Crete and neighbouring islands of Thera, Rhodes and Cos; and also the Ionic islands were occupied by the Ionians. In most of these places the dialects were grafted onto the earlier settlements. All of this took place around the eleventh century BC, which is the starting date for the establishment of the three great dialects – Ionic-Attic, Aeolic and Doric – and also for the implantation of the isoglosses that tended to either merge them or fragment them.

In Greece itself, the city was now the political centre, whether unifying vast territories under its rule (synœcisms such as that of Attica); joining confederations (such as that of the Boeotians); conquering territories and subduing their populations (as Lacedaemon did in Messenia, Athens in Oropus and Eleutherae); or promoting

wars (between Eretria and Chalcis, Athens and Megara). All of this had linguistic consequences, the main one being that the dialects (and alphabets) tended to coincide with the cities. But this is not always the case; see § 131 on the Ionic dialect of Asia.

Colonization

95. Towards the eighth century the dialects were practically fully formed. The colonisation of Magna Graecia was just beginning, with Sicily and southern Italy dominated by the Greeks, and this period is also marked by the origin and diffusion of the alphabet. This is the point in which the great diffusion of the Greek language began.

Outside Magna Graecia, in their colonisation the Greeks generally only founded isolated cities in the coastal region around the Black Sea and almost the whole of the Mediterranean: they would settle on small islands or on a promontory on the coast, and sometimes they would extend their dominion to a nearby region on the continent.

The regions dominated by the Phoenicians and Carthaginians were an exception: that is, the N. of Africa to the W. of Cyrene, the W. of Sicily, the islands of the western Mediterranean and the S. of Spain. The Greeks were driven out of all these places after the battle of Alalia in 535. The Phocæans had been the first to arrive in this region, according to Herodotus (I 165 ff., IV 152), but after their defeat in Alalia against the Etruscans and Carthaginians, the western Mediterranean was closed to the Greeks.

96. With this exception, the cities of the Greeks extended along the entire coastal region, and were like frogs around a pond, to use Plato's expression (*Phaedo* 109 b). Various Greek dialects, but principally Doric and Ionic, were spoken there.

The Greeks left inscriptions very early on: the phenomenon of colonisation follows only a little later that of the diffusion of the alphabet. The inscription on the cup of Pithecusa from the eighth century is perhaps the oldest Greek inscription, followed by that of the *oinokhoe* from the *Dipylon* in Athens, somewhat later. Also, literature arrived from Greece and a new literature was created, from the eighth century onwards in Asia and from the seventh century in Sicily, and the arts flourished. These Greek cities were in constant contact with the indigenous peoples of the interior who, from here, borrowed so much from Greek culture, the alphabet being one of the

most important cultural loans (but this will be examined further on).

The founding of the Greek colonies marked the culminations of the resumption of the travels of exploration and commerce. In Pontus, Asia and the West, the Greeks had followed in the footsteps of the Mycenaeans and the exploration myths of the Argonauts, of Heracles and Odysseus. The *Odyssey* described the navigations of Odysseus in the western Mediterranean, linking the Mycenaean navigations and those of the eighth century (cf. Adrados 1998c). Stesichorus introduced the account of Heracles's voyage to the West to Tartessus, which would have been familiar to Greeks of that period, who traded there. It is even possible that in places such as Miletus or Thapsus, the Greek dialects from the Mycenaean period would have survived and served as a base for the new Greek dialects.

Today we have a better understanding of trade in the archaic period, which in effect continued the former trade routes through Pontus and the East. Between such distant locations as al-Mīnā, Tell Sūkās, Pithecusae and Naukratis we can find traces of Greek trade from the ninth century onwards, where Greeks later coexisted with the Phoenicians and the local populations. Subsequently, Greek emporia proper emerged, and later real cities.

A community of Greeks and Phoenicians existed in more archaic times; a ship could transport mixed merchandises. Only later was there a strong rivalry between them, and even war (I have discussed the apportionment of the Mediterranean above).

97. It is a complicated phenomenon. The oldest of the cities that founded colonies were Euboea, Chalcis and Eretria, which established colonies in Corcyra, the gulf of Naples (Pithecusae, Cumae), the E. of Sicily and Italy (Naxos, Leontini, Catana, Rhegium) and Chalcidice (Torone, Mende, Methone); Corinth, which displaced the Chalcidians in Corcyra and founded Potidaea and Syracuse (the latter together with the Lacedaemonians); Megara, which founded Megara Hyblæa in Sicily and Byzantion and Chalcedon at the entrance to the Black Sea; the cities of Asia Minor, Miletus (which colonized the Black Sea) and Phocaea (which colonized the West); and afterwards Thera (Cyrene), Lacedaemon (Tarentum), etc.

Some colonies, in turn, founded other colonies, for example Massilia, the Phocæan colony; and sometimes, two cities united to found one colony (I have cited the case of Syracuse). There was even an entire city, Phocaea, which towards the year 540 displaced itself to Corsica,

to Alalia (which had been founded around 560), fleeing from the Persians. In short, most frequently, one or various cities founded a colony in a planned way, in order to relieve the strain of an excess population or to create a fulcrum for their trade or power.

This is not the appropriate place for a detailed look at Greek colonisation and its enormous cultural repercussions in Greece itself. The oldest colonies in the mid-eighth century are those of Pithecusae (really an *emporium*) and Cumæ (757) in Italy, Naxos in Sicily (734), followed by Syracuse (733) and later by many more. The colonies of Miletus and other cities around the Black Sea are almost contemporary; Naukratis, a trading post in Egypt, dates from the seventh century; more recent are the colonies of the W., first Massilia, cited previously, towards 600, and from there Emporion in Spain and others.

98. For an echo of the colonization in the *Odyssey*, cf. my article, previously cited, 'Navegaciones . . .' (1998c); on Stesichorus and Tartessus, Adrados 1978, p. 261 ff. On Greek trade and the founding of colonies see, among various works, the book by J. Boardman 1973 and other works previously cited; the collaborations of T. F. R. G. Braun and of J. M. Cook in the re-edition of *Cambridge Ancient History*, 1982, and of A. J. Graham in the same work, 1983; G. Pugliese Carratelli 1985; F. G. Fernández Nieto 1983; S. Deger-Jalkotzy (ed.) 1983 and 1992; P. G. Descoeudres (ed.) 1990; P. Rouillard 1991; G. Tsetskhladze–F. de Angelis (eds.) 1994; etc. The book by N. G. L. Hammond, as cited previously, contains not only a good exposition on p. 109 ff., but also an impressive account of the Greek colonies in the eighth to the seventh centuries (p. 657 ff.). V. Alonso Troncoso 1994 provides more references. On the Greek vocabulary of the colonisation, see M. Casevitz 1985.

99. The colonisation should be regarded as a new Greek expansion, which went far beyond that initiated in the Mycenaean period. It should also be seen as the start of the expansion of Greek culture – arts, a way of life – and of the Greek language, which to us is particularly reflected in writing. Yet this was but a repetition on a grander scale of the Mycenaean expansion and the continuation of the diffusion of the eastern Greek dialects and of the western dialects in Greece itself, where the new dialects were formed. The introduction of the alphabet in the mid-eighth century in Greece and Asia, as well as in the large islands of the Aegean and in Ionia, Sicily, and Italy, along with all the colonies, marked the start of a great diffusion of Greek, or of different Greeks.

2. The diffusion of Greek

The alphabet and its diffusion

100. The different Greek dialects of the first millennium are known to us from the eighth century BC onwards, whether directly, through inscriptions in stone and ceramics in particular, or indirectly, through the literary tradition which is reflected in the manuscripts. There are two kinds of texts: those in the Greek that was spoken in the different cities, which has been transmitted to us mainly through inscriptions; and those in literary Greek, the common languages that have been transmitted to us through inscriptions to some extent and also through manuscripts.

This is based on a fundamental fact: the invention of the Greek alphabet, a derivative of northern Semitic alphabet, to which, as we know, it adds the vowels. It was probably the invention of only one person (or if there were various alphabets, then only one was diffused) for trade purposes. It must have originated in a place where Greeks and Phoenicians coexisted: Al-Mīnā has been proposed (perhaps ancient Posideion, on the coast of Syria), Rhodes and Crete, in particular. Trade is better conducted with the aid of written documents, and we have evidence of such, although of a later date, and also of the transmission of the Greek alphabet to the West.

However, the hypothesis that the Greek alphabet was introduced in order to write the poems of the *aoidoí* is entirely unlikely; although it is true to say that it was used in the same century (eighth) for poetic inscriptions (dedicatory, funerary). This must have been a stage preceding its systematic use by the *aoidoí.*

The fact is, it is thought today that from the end of the ninth century the Greek alphabet was spread out over the whole of the Greek world and was beginning to penetrate the neighbouring regions. I have referred to the most ancient inscriptions of Pithecusæ and Athens from the eighth century. Thereafter, very early inscriptions are found in Thera, Crete, Naxos, Kalymnos, Aegina, Boeotia, Argolis, Corinth and Corcyra; and also derived alphabets in Etrutia, Caria and Phrygia.

101. It is widely accepted that the Greek alphabet derived from the Phoenician alphabet: the ancients knew this, cf. Herodotus V 58, and Tacitus, *Annales* XI 14, φοινικήϊα 'letters' in an inscription in Teos (*Schwyzer* 710.B.37) and the verb ποινικάζεν 'write' in Crete, cf.

SEG 26.631.A5 (there are related forms). In effect, it is very close to the Phoenician alphabet, which we know from the thirteenth-century inscription in the sepulchre of King Ahiram of Byblos. There is some debate regarding the relation between this alphabet and the cuneiforme alphabet of Ugarit, which was created in the fourtheenth century. As far as the date is concerned, most authors incline towards some point in the eighth century, although an older date is often still proposed.

It is also believed that the Greek alphabet differs from the Phoenician in that it derives the five vowels: *a, e, o* from the three laryngeals, *u* and *i* from *wau* and *yod*. Another difference is that it possesses only one sibilant phoneme. Its most archaic form can also be found in the alphabet of Crete, Thera, Melos and Sikinos, which lacks the letters to mark the labial and guttural aspirated occlusives and the double letters (ψ and ξ), which were introduced by later alphabets; likewise, some of them lack the marking of the quantities of the *e* and *o*, have other uses of double consonants, etc. The Ionic and western alphabets are the most evolved.

In any case, it is clear that the Greek alphabet was created by a speaker of a dialect that was not psilotic and did not lack ϝ. It is also evident that it was diffused through Crete in various directions, among others, by way of Corinth, towards the west. It seems that the variants of Eretria and Aegina arrived in Attica and were contaminated there.

102. The principal work on the history of the alphabet is by L. H. Jeffrey 1990 (2nd ed.): it proposes that the Greek alphabet was taken from the Phoenician in Al-Mīnā, as cited previously. Other proposals are Rhodes and Crete or Rhodes through Crete, or Crete proper (Rh. Carpenter in G. Pfohl (ed.) 1968a, pp. 1–39, M. Falkner, ibid., pp. 143–171, M. Guarducci, ibid., pp. 197–213); M. G. Amasdasi 1991 refers more vaguely to Syria and Asia Minor. Cyprus (where Greeks and Phoenicians coexisted in Citium) seems to be excluded because the syllabary continued to be used there (but there are those who think that it was precisely the mark of the vowels in this syllabary that was the source of inspiration for the creator of the alphabet).

With regard to the date, the eighth century is generally considered the most probable, as sustained by Carpenter and Jeffrey in the works cited and by R. Wachter 1989; also, I. B. S. Iselin 1991 and M. G. Amadasi 1991. J. de Hoz (forthcoming) adheres to the end of the ninth century. However, there are those who propose older dates, even the twelfth century or earlier: for instance, B. L. Ullmann (in G. Pfohl 1968b, p. 40 ff.) and J. Naveh 1982. On the Ugarit and Phoenician alphabets, see O. Eissfeldt

(in G. Pfohl 1968b, pp. 214 ff. and 221 ff.), M. Dietrich and O. Lorentz 1991, and A. R. Millard 1991.

It is also generally accepted that the alphabet was acquired first and foremost for trade purposes, although the data available is of a later date: materials such as lead, wooden tablets, *ostraca*, etc. were used. But B. B. Powell 1991 thinks that its primary purpose, in view of the frequency of verse epigrams in archaic times, was to record Homeric poetry. See, in contrast, R. Schmidt, *Kratylos* 37, 1992, p. 69 ff. A secondary use, such as that of sepulchral, honorific and even ludic inscriptions, was followed by a tertiary use: by the *aoidoí.*

The subject of the discovery of the vowels by the Greeks can be considered as completely elucidated. Various factors contributed to this: the knowledge of the marking of vowels in Cyprian and Ugaritic; the need to write syllables of the type VC-, nonexistant in Phoenician, and the nonexistence, in turn, of the glottal attack (the laryngeals) in Greek; and the existence of certain Phoenician inscriptions which transcribe Luwian names using *aleph* and *waw* to mark the vowels and initial *u, aleph* and *yod* to indicate vowels of internal syllables. The road ahead was prepared, there was a need and there were models. For more details on the adaptation, see Cf. Brixhe 1991b.

103. The fact is, as soon as the practice of trade and politics was resumed, when intellectual life began to flourish and the diverse dialects were almost fully constituted, the alphabet spread very quickly, enabling the recording and archiving of commercial transactions as well as of political and private documents and literary works, although the methods of oral diffusion did not disappear. This was a huge advantage for the development of Greek life, language and culture, and for its diffusion among neighbouring peoples, Greece itself, and indeed the whole Greek world.

For a second time, the Greeks, in this relaunching of their history (more dynamic and with a greater projection than the first) adopted a graphic system from a foreign people. But they would use it in a more general way and not just as an administrative instrument. This would enable scholars of the Greek language to gain direct access to the geographical and literary dialects through inscriptions and the manuscript tradition. Indeed, the indirect knowledge, through Homer and the dialects of the first millennium, of a dialect from the second millennium is possible thanks to this script.

The dialects of so many peoples would become alphabetised as a result, at this point or during the Hellenistic period, thus opening the way for the diffusion of Greek language and culture.

Inscriptions, literature and hellenisation

104. Let us make a few observations on the inscriptions (including graffiti) and the literary texts that were produced or created from this point on, from which we obtain our knowledge of Greek language and culture. Here, we are dealing with private or public texts; whether in prose, in the local alphabets and dialects, in verse, or in the poetic languages of Greece (literary prose dates from the sixth century, as we know). These texts have been preserved in manuscripts and inscriptions on various materials (stone, ceramic, metal, wood, even ivory; the oldest papyri are from the fourth century). Yet the manuscript tradition does not shed any light on the official documentation that was kept in the archives, only the inscriptions are able to do so. And there is an almost complete lack of data on the economic use of the new script.

It must be stressed that the Phoenician inscriptions (followed by the Punic inscriptions) offered a model for the Greek ones, not just with regard to letters but also the writing of the text. Among the oldest are the sepulchral inscriptions such as that of King Ahiram, expository inscriptions by kings about their wars and exploits (for example, king Mesha of Moab), dedicatory inscriptions such as that found on the bronze helmet discovered in Cyprus; and others. The Greeks dispensed not only with the syllabic scripts but also with the use of mud or brick tablets. The introduction of parchment completes the picture.

Books such as that by Jeffrey 1990, previously cited, and by Guarducci 1967, not to mention the large collections, illustrate the enormous diffusion of Greek inscriptions, their numeric increase from century to century and the immense variety of their content. Individuals could engrave sepulchral epitaphs, dedications to the gods, there are inscriptions denoting ownership (such as the Pithecusæ cup), inscriptions of artists, lovers, and we find school excercises or simple lists of names such as those of the Greek soldiers who engraved their names in the colossi of Abu Simbel around 668 BC.

However, public inscriptions from cities or temples are more frequent: these include all kinds of lists (of archons, priests, ephori, war casualties, etc.; inventories of temples, etc.) decrees and laws, concessions of honours and priviledges, texts relating to sport competitions, to festivals or sacrifices, or to the erection of monuments, official letters and even chronicles such as that of Lindos or the *Marmor Parium*.

Cities or individuals could also engrave literary texts, as for example Archilochus's passages in a *heroon* which the people of Paros dedicated to him, or Sappho's *ostracon.* The variety of content increased as time went on.

Cities, sanctuaries, and mere individuals now had an instrument with which they could use the Greek language in their daily lives, which they could make accessible to people in other cities and ages, and to non-Greek peoples too. The utility of the script accounts for its sudden, great success.

105. However, it is important to note that the use of the script in literature was only gradual. Here, the papyrus had a more important role to play, despite the fact that we only have samples from the fourth century onwards. But we must assume that, from the archaic period onwards, it was greatly used in the private, public and literary spheres.

To be sure, the book as such did not exist until the fifth century and the diffusion of literature was mainly oral. But private copies existed, which were copied for use by *aoidoí* who recited epic poems or by performers of lyric, including the commensals who sang elegies and skolia in particular. Of course, there is some debate about whether Homer and Hesiod, in the eighth century, either wrote poems or dictated them; in any case, from this point on, writing was at the service of the transmission and diffusion of literature. Homer was known everywhere, and elegy and choral lyric were written everywhere in the appropriate dialect.

The best illustration of this can be found in the inscriptions and epigrams in verse, which had such a great diffusion from the very start of writing: the two oldest Greek inscriptions, of Pithecusæ and Athens as cited, are in verse. A collection such as that of Hansen 1983, which contains inscriptions in verse from the eighth to the fifth century, demonstrates their wide diffusion and abundance. They are mainly sepulchral and votive, but also honorific, agonistic, relating to ownership, constructions or foundations, artists, etc.

106. From the language perspective, it is important to emphasise that inscriptions partly reflect the local dialects, but that, particularly in the case of inscriptions in elegiac distichs, the most numerous by far, the international language of elegy of which I have spoken is mostly imposed.

The diffusion of the great dialects (Ionic and Doric, Aeolic in Asia) and their local variants, sometimes modified in the colonies, is important in the inscriptions. We know the variants represented by Pamphylian, Syracusan or for example the language of Cyrene, variants which are not always easy to interpret with respect to origin.

We would hardly know of these variants without the inscriptions, for only a few of the Greek dialects cultivated literature. They were languages for daily life and for registering official and private documents, whose use was thus not much wider than that of Mycenaean.

So, the case of prose inscriptions written in the dialect of each city, and of inscriptions in literature is different. The latter used, on the one hand, the local dialects, which were hardly diffused externally: the iambi used Ionic (but Solon's is in Attic); Alcman used Laconian; Sappho and Alcaeus used Lesbian; Corinna used Boeotian; Epicharmus and Sophron used Syracusan, always with a generally strong Homeric and literary influence. It was only later, from the sixth century onwards, that Ionic prose was created and diffused into all regions; and towards the end of the fifth century, Attic prose.

Yet, the world of literature – which was cultivated in a few cities from the end of the eighth century onwards, and particularly in the seventh and sixth centuries – was an international world that principally cultivated international languages: the Homeric language, first and foremost, which we believe to be an evolution of the epic language of the previous millennium in Asia Minor; subsequently, the language of elegy, which contains many Homeric and Ionic elements; and the language of choral lyric, based on Doric, but also very Homericised. We must turn our attention to these languages.

Thus, it could be said that to a certain extent the linguistic situation in the Mycenaean period was repeated here. Local dialects existed, some of which at times had a literary cultivation. But international poetic languages also existed. Poets attended the great festivals – in Sparta, Delphi, Delos, Athens – or were called to the courts of kings and tyrants – Corinth, Samos, Syracuse – and there they sang in these international languages. Poetry contributed to the reunification of the Greek dialects, and also established relations between the different dialects, thereby making them intelligible.

107. On Phoenician inscriptions, cf. Rh. Carpenter 1968, previously cited. A general overview of Greek inscriptions can be found in the book by Jefferey 1990 and also in M. Guarducci 1967 and Hansen 1983.

For the diffusion of Greek literature, see Adrados 1953b. The script of the Homeric text and its oral character is discussed in §§ 140 ff.; on orality in general, among an abundant literature, see J. A. Fernández Delgado 1983, W. Kullmann and M. Reichel (eds.) 1990 and E. A. Havelock 1986, 1990.

It is important to stress that the alphabet was first used to write down local dialects, presenting local variants too. Its use in the international diffusion of literature represents a second phase, which gave privilege to the alphabets in which the literature was expressed and, of course, to the literary languages we have referred to above.

108. There was a proliferation of Greek inscriptions throughout the Mediterranean. Even non-Greek peoples wrote in Greek, while others borrowed the Greek alphabet, in a more or less modified form, to write their own languages, following the Greek model in every way (as regards the type of inscription, formulas, syntax and certain lexicon).

To cite the point furthest from Greece and least Hellenised, the Iberian peninsula, we find in Ampurias and its surrounding areas (Pech Maho, in France) around the year 500 commercial letters and documents written in lead (there is also a *defixio*) or terracotta, in addition to inscriptions of the private kind (such as a donation) in ceramic vases. There are numerous inscriptions on ceramic vases in Huelva, Malaga and Alicante, indicating the owner, a dedication or other data; and other inscriptions on oil amphoras brought directly or indirectly from Attica.

This is not all. Iberian inscriptions were written in Greek letters (as, similarly, celtic inscriptions were so written in Gallia). Of course, different alphabets or semi-alphabets were created to record Iberian, Tartessian and Celto-Iberian, with a great predominance of Greek letters, although this is a complicated topic. The Greeks definitely alphabetised Hispania and commercial reasons probably made this expansion necessary and inevitable, as in the case of Italy.

109. See the edition of the *Inscriptiones Graecae Antiquissimae Iberiae* by H. Rodríguez Somolinos 1998b and the article by De Hoz 1970 on Attic inscriptions. For the Greco-Iberian inscriptions of Alicante, see the same author 1987 (but they correspond to the fourth century). With regard to the origins of the scripts of the pre-Roman languages, there is an abundant bibliography, cf. a summary in de Hoz 1969, who dates some of these back to the eighth century (p. 113), as well as another work of 1979. In addition, see the two recent works by the same author, 1991 and 1996, in which he places the Phoenician alphabet before the Greek as regards the origin of the Hispanic semi-alphabets.

110. This is but a minor example of what was happening throughout the Mediterranean. There were similar events in Europe and Asia. In Phrygia, for instance, inscriptions have been discovered dating from the eighth century onwards in an alphabet that is derived from the Greek, and one notices both Greek influences in Phrygian and Phrygian influences in Greek (there is also a trilingual Greek-Lycian-Aramaic). The same goes for Thracian, for which we have inscriptions with Greek letters in gold rings and silver vessels from the sixth to fifth centuries BC; for Carian, for which we have inscriptions in a semi-Greek alphabet from the the seventh century onwards; and for Lydian, known from the same date, and many others.

In Sicily and Italy the case is similar. The Greek origin of the Etruscan and Latin alphabets is well known; they are believed to be independent of each other, although some think that the Latin alphabet derives from the Etruscan. In any case, we are dealing with alphabets of the western kind, taken from the Chalcidians of Euboea, probably in Cumæ. The Etruscan alphabet is known to us from the seventh century, the Latin alphabet from the sixth century.

The alphabet had become established in Etruria before the arrival of the Corinthian Demaratus, father of the first Etruscan king of Rome, Tarquinius Priscus (according to ancient sources, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *A.R.* III 46, Livius I 34). Demaratus had arrived through Pithecusae, accompanied by three Corinthian craftsmen who displayed their art in Italy. Yet, it is not only the Etruscan (from Etruria) and Latin alphabets that derive from the Greek alphabet of Cumæ, but also the Etruscan alphabets of Campania, the Oscan alphabet and the Umbrian. Cf. G. Devoto 1968, p. 89.

This is but one of the many examples of profound Hellenisation in Etruria from the seventh century onwards and somewhat later in Rome: from the fifth century onwards, Greek terracotta (or terracotta of Greek inspiration), Greek cults and Greek words (sometimes with an Etruscan influence, such as *triumpe, amurca, sporta, persona*) are found in Rome. The two languages were penetrated with Greek (In the case of Etruscan, particularly as regards theonyms and the names of heroes, but also common names). In Latin, there are Greek borrowings from archaic times: words such as those cited and other old borrowings such as *camera, gubernare, oleum, Pollux.*

111. For Phrygian, see C. Brixhe in E. Vineis (ed.) 1983, pp. 109–133; for Thracian, V. Georgiev 1981, p. 111 ff.; for Lycian, G. Neumann in E.

Vineis (ed.) 1983, pp. 135–151; for Carian, I. J. Adiego 1993 and M. E. Giannotta, et al. (eds.) 1994. For the languages of Asia Minor in general, G. Neumann 1980 and the corresponding chapters in F. Villar 1996a. On the Etruscan alphabet cf. G. and L. Bonfante 1985, p. 60 ff., and D. Briquel 1991 (where it is considered as being introduced by nobles, as an object of prestige); on Latin, F. Sommer, 3rd ed., 1948, p. 23 ff. A large series of Greek borrowings in Etruscan can be found in M. Pittau 1994, p. 257 ff.; for older Greek borrowings in Latin, see §§ 291 ff. Yet there are also inscriptions of various pre-Latin languages of Sicily (those of the Sicani, Siculi and Elymians) with Greek letters, cf. R. Ambrosini 1979, 1983.

3. The creation of the great dialects

Generalities

112. The three dialectal groups known to us as Ionic-Attic, Arcado-Cyprian and Aeolic were created within EG; WG, which is not part of this group, arrived later and tends to distinguish between Doric and N.W. Greek.

As we have seen, there were differences within this EG, perhaps before it entered Greece, but certainly within Greece. Characteristics that affected all of EG or a particular part of it are reflected in Ion.-Att. and Arc.-Cyp., or in the latter and Aeol. Yet these characteristics did not always affect all of the dialects within each group, although we are uncertain whether this is an old or a more recent development. The differences between Doric and N.W. Greek present similar problems.

However, turning our attention to EG, we have said that the characteristics referred to are actually archaisms that have been preserved or choices between doublets, and not innovations. Innovations were developed and the dialects finished forming themselves in the post-Mycenaean period, when the Dorian invasion had isolated the central nuclei of these dialects: Attica (but see § 118), Arcadia and Thessaly, the regions from which a migration to Asia and the islands would depart. But they should not be regarded as unitary dialects, for we find archaisms, choices and innovations only in parts of them.

As I have repeatedly shown, the attribution of a post-Mycenaean origin to the three great dialects has become a general doctrine, based on the works of Porzig and Risch in the 1950s. García Ramón

has made a strong case for Aeolic in particular. I insist that this view is correct, but only if one accepts an earlier base, and the start of the differentiation in the Mycenaean period.

The key method for the study of this 'dialectal genealogy' (for both EG and WG, in general) lies in demonstrating the ancient similarity of the two dialects because they share innovations; the choices also have a probationary character, but to a lesser degree. The more serious problem is that of establishing which characteristics are innovations and which are not; in doublets one must also determine whether one of the two forms is an innovation. Furthermore, in some cases, a relative chronology must be established.

There has been much progress in this field as regards the establishment of relative and absolute chronologies. But doubts remain, as in the case of the secondary extension of the isoglosses.

113. In my small book *La dialectología griega como fuente para el estudio de las migraciones indoeuropeas en Grecia*, published for the first time in 1952 (2nd ed. 1997), I still followed the old theory of Kretschmer and Tovar, perhaps due to a traditional inertia, which proposed that Ionic, the most evolved dialect, was the first to penetrate Greece. However, I established two principles which I believe have been essential to all subsequent investigation: the existence of an EG with three main dialects and of a WG (in addition to the criteria of supporting this investigation on the different probationary value of the innovations, choices and archaisms, and in the chronology).

This book is at the base of subsequent investigations, such as those of Porzig and Risch, cited previously, and others. Sometimes I am frequently cited, as in R. Schmitt 1977, p. 125, E. Risch 1979, p. 94, and A. López Eire and J. Méndez Dosuna; sometimes not at all, as in W. Porzig and E. Risch in the works cited, and J. Chadwick 1956, who nevertheless follows my doctrine. In the prologue to a re-edition of my book, cited above, I provide the proper base for the whole theory of innovations and choices, and trace the history of the investigation. At times, surprising discoveries are made: R. Hodot 'discovers' (in E. Crespo 1993, p. 207) that ἄν and κε coexisted in ancient times, something which I have been saying since 1952.

In the prologue cited, I also draw attention to my criticism of certain modern currents of thought that attempt to undermine the genealogical study of dialects. Although a very detailed and exact study of the data is essential, it must be added that without this other study the history of the Greek language cannot be written. See also my observations in Adrados 1994e.

The chronology of the dialects has been examined by A. Bartoněk 1979 and 1987 in particular, as well as A. López Eire 1977, 1989a, etc. But today, practically every study on these subjects is based on chronology, which is essentially linguistic in nature; the archeological arguments (the lack of Dorian remains in Attica, etc.) and those of ancient tradition are a secondary support.

For the evolution of the studies on Greek dialectology, see Adrados 1998b; also R. A. Santiago 1997. For tendencies that insist on the importance of description – that is, sociolinguistic description (which is relevant, but not if it involves a hypercritique of the genealogical study), cf. M. Bile 1990a and b, and Cl. Brixhe 1990a and b. The distance that is sometimes proposed between the Greek of the second and the Greek of the first millennium, and between Mycenaean and subsequent dialects is excessive.

114. Certainly, problems persist with regard to the three great dialects of EG, not just regarding to what extent they were prefigured in second-millennium EG and to what extent they were once unitary. There are also problems that affect WG.

One problem is the origin of certain differences within the dialects. Some scholars even deny Arc.-Cyp. ever existed, and there are divergent opinions regarding the relation between Doric and N.W. Greek. With respect to Aeolic, Lesbian sometimes coincides with Ionic, Boeotian and Thessalian (or parts of them) with Doric. Are these recent phenomena through a secondary diffusion of isoglosses, or, in some cases, a result of the superimposition of peoples? This has also been proposed with regard to Cretan Doric, which seems to have retained Achaean characteristics; and with regard to Pamphylian, where today the existence of Doric characteristics are nevertheless denied, see § 120.

Characteristics which are considered to be Doric may be found outside these dialects. The facts must be examined carefully because sometimes, as in the case of Pamphylian, we are dealing with archaisms or coincidences in the choice which may not be related but independent of each other. It serves to recall the theoretically possible Doricisms in Homer.

Of course, this makes the definition of the four great dialects difficult, as does the establishment of their ancient limits and of possible modern movements of borders.

In any case, we will schematically divide the study of the dialects into three parts, which follow a more thematic than chronological scheme: first, the differentiation of Ionic-Attic, Arcado-Cyprian and Pamphylian, Aeolic and Doric; second, the characteristics which helped to bring them closer together at some point; third, the new differentiations. The first part is studied in this section on 'The creation of the great dialects'; the other two parts are considered in the following sections.

115. A very complete overview (though somewhat outdated today) of Greek dialectology and the particular aspects cited can be found in R. Schmitt 1977 and J. L. García Ramón (1999). The great traditional treatises are by F. Bechtel 1921–1924, A. Debrunner–A. Scherer 1969 and, within Greek grammar in general, E. Schwyzer 1939 ff. We will provide the most recent bibliography of note with regard to each dialect.

The reader should not expect a detailed study in this book. This purpose is served by the general treatises of dialectology, which not only provide the relevant data but also the sources and bibliography, in addition to historical interpretations. Here, we are interested in outlining the characteristics of the linguistic history of Greece, with its successive processes of dialectal differentiation and unification and the interplay of the spoken and literary dialects peculiar to it.

Ionic-Attic

116. Ionic-Attic occupied Attica, the islands, the coast of Asia Minor facing Greece and the colonies of the cities situated there. It is known to us from ancient inscriptions of the eighth and seventh centuries BC, but no doubt it originates from an earlier date. It continued the old Mycenaean dominion in Athens and in parts of Asia Minor, such as Miletus.

Athens possessed a Mycenaean palace in the Acropolis, but myth presents the city as a vassal of Minos. It must have been more important in the Mycenaean period itself and, judging by the archaeological remains, especially in the post-Mycenaean and geometric period; a vase from this period contains a very ancient Greek alphabetic inscription, to which I referred earlier. There is no trace, whether in archaeology, myth, or history, of a Dorian invasion. Isolated from the Dorians, with whom they did not even share a common border (Boeotia was Aeolic territory, another derivation of para-Mycenaean), Athens developed its own dialect. Athens was also isolated from Peloponnesian para-Mycenaean, from which Arcado-Cyprian descended. Thus, what could have constituted the beginnings of a para-Mycenaean dialect common to Attica and the Peloponnese became fragmented.

117. However, the dialectal complex did not just extend to Attica but also to the islands and Asia Minor. Following Sakellaríou, I have already discussed the great emigration to Asia by the Greeks from the Peloponnese, who had been invaded by the Dorians. Yet Solon, as we saw, describes Athens as 'the oldest land of Ionia' and Herodotus (VII 2) refers to emigration from Attica to the Asian Ionia. But

Herodotus himself depicts other traditions regarding the Ionians who departed to Asia from central Greece and the Peloponnese: Orchomenus, Euboea, Messenia, Phocis, etc. In the Peloponnese, toponyms and various mythical names can be found that recall the name of the Ionians.

The fact is, there is a series of innovations of Ionic-Attic, particularly phonetic ones, which were transmitted by sea from some point and were not always totally consolidated in the seventh century. According to A. Bartoněk 1977, p. 121 ff., they only became diffused from 900 BC onwards.

A list of the main innovations and choices can be found in Adrados 1976b, p. 272 s., R. Schmitt 1977 or in A. López Eire 1977 and 1989: ᾱ > η (incomplete in the Ionic of the islands in the sixth and seventh centuries), ephelcistic -ν, lengthenings of the type -εσμ- > -ειμ-, vocalism and the prothesis of εἴκοσι, βούλομαι, etc., the ει, ου lengthening before a sonant plus ϝ, the hiatus abbreviation and metathesis of quantity, ἡμέες and ὑμέες (and contractions), ἕτερος, in addition to the innovations that the dialect shares with others.

In this way, the Ionic-Attic dialect was formed on a common para-Mycenaean base but with innovations that became diffused by sea and which we cannot date before the ninth century BC.

Nevertheless, apart from the differences in Eretria and Oropus (see § 118) there are also differences between Ionic and Attic. The latter dialect preserved archaisms such as ξύν, πόλει, the aspiration and the dual, and there are choices which have been brought to the very end (τέσσαρες, ἱερός, the metathesis of quantity). Also, its own innovations: the return of η to ᾱ after ρ, ι, ε; the G. sg. νεανίου, certain innovations in the lexicon, etc. A progressive differentiation undoubtedly took place, perhaps in an archaic phase, within Attica (cf. A. López Eire 1972–1973 and 1985). Also, Attic shares some innovations with neighbouring dialects, as in the creation of ττ, ρρ.

118. On the ancient traditions relating to the origin of the Ionians, cf. A. Tovar 1994, p. 289 ff. Bonfante 1984, p. 205 states that Homer 'hides' the name of the Ionians (he only mentions them once, in relation to Attica), as well as that of the Dorians (he also mentions them only once, in relation to Crete).

On Ionic-Attic, in addition to the bibliography cited, cf. A. López Eire 1971 (with J. Méndez Dosuna), 1972–1973, 1984a, 1985, 1987b and 1989, M. Negri 1981a and 1982a and b, and W. S. Allen 1987: different con-

tacts must be added to its innovations. Elsewhere, there are those who see Ionic-Attic as a synthesis of two dialects rather than a differentiation. For the elimination in Attic of the common lexicon of other dialects, cf. Adrados 1953a and 1957. There is a clear relation between Attica, the islands, and the Asiatic continent in archaic times, symbolised by the role of the Delos sanctuary (from the seventh century onwards, it is believed) and the Attic colonisation of Troas (from the sixth century onwards).

Naturally, the problem of Lesbian should not be forgotten, as well as that of the subdialects (Eretria, Oropus) and of the isoglosses with central Greece (we must return to this, in particular). Also, of course, there is the problem of whether there were different dialects within Ionic; and of the 'Atticisation' of Ionic, which led to the creation of *koine*. There is no trace of differences within Attic, as a result of the strict unification of the territory under Cleisthenes (and before him, mythically, under Theseus).

See, for Aeolic in Asia, C. J. Ruijgh 1995–1996, who postulates the existence of Ionic influences in Aeolic; for example, the inf. in -ναι would be due to a contamination with the inf. in -μεναι.

Arcado-Cyprian and Pamphylian

119. Clearly, Arcadian was left isolated in the centre of the Peloponnese by the Dorian invasion, and before it was entirely carried out, peoples from the Peloponnese settled in Cyprus, where Mycenaean settlements had already been established; and, no doubt, in Pamphylia, judging by similarities in the dialects. This is supported by myth, which present the hero Teucer, founder of Salamis of Cyprus, going to Cyprus. Perhaps this dialect extended to Rhodes and Crete before the arrival of the Dorians (cf. §§ 131 f.).

The existence of an Arcado-Cyprian dialect group, though disputed at times, is generally accepted; so too is its link to the group that also included Ionic-Attic, which has been discussed.

Aside from the archaisms, innovations, and choices common to other dialects, we can provide some specific Arcado-Cyprian material along with the characteristics that go back to EG. I would like to recall archaisms such as the preservation of the ϝ or of the verbal desinence -το(ι); choices such as the names in -ης (instead of -ευς), the Cyp. pronoun *o-ni*/Arc. ὀνε, etc. But, above all, innovations such as εν > ιν, -ο > -υ (also in Pamphylian), the sibilant solution of the labiovelar before the vowels ε, ι, ἀνα > ὀν, the conjunctions and prepositions *po-se*/πός, *ka-se*/κάς. Of course, this also applies to archaisms in only one dialect (Cyp. *pt-*, G. sg. *-o*, *o-ne*, dual in Arc.) or innovations also in only one dialect (Arc. -κρετης, Cyp. αἶλος).

In fact, the innovations of Arcado-Cyprian are not so numerous compared to those of Ionic-Attic, which are more conspicuous too. It often hesitates where the latter chooses in a decisive way: for example, in the aor. and fut. of verbs in -ζω (Ion.-At. -σα, -σω, here -ξ- sometimes occurs). Arcado-Cyprian is a relegated dialect, which did not have a literary development and even adopted an archaic script in Cyprus, the Cyprian syllabary. Indeed, Ionic-Attic was the dialect that stood out from the rest and made its mark, whereas Arcado-Cyprian can be seen as the archaic remnant that remained isolated, although it does contain some characteristics of its own.

Ionic-Attic, with a series of ancient common characteristics, separated from the rest, and in its Attic variety came to form the centre of the Greek language.

120. For Arc.-Cyp., see, in addition to the bibliography cited, A. Lillo 1979, who (like A. López Eire and J. Méndez Dosuna 1971 and myself since 1952) considers it a derivative of the group that it formed part of at an earlier date, together with Ionic-Attic (as we have seen, for some authors there are pre-forms of both dialects in the second millennium). J. Chadwick 1988 and E. Risch 1988 tend to understate – excessively, I believe – the links between Arcadian and Cyprian.

With respect to Pamphylian as a derivative of the same group, but with later elements, I have already cited the works of A. López Eire and A. Lillo 1982 and 1983, and of M. García Teijeiro 1984. Pamphylian may preserve certain archaisms alien to Arc.-Cyp., such as *-ti*. Possibly, it comes from an area of the Mycenaean world related to the dialect that we call Mycenaean and with the later Arcado-Cyprian dialect; but it does not appear to be influenced by Doric or Aeolic, the coincidences with these are archaisms. However, in the phase in which it is known to us, it does contain influences from the *koine*.

Aeolic

121. As we have seen, the Aeolic dialects – Thessalian, Boeotian and Lesbian—continue various isoglosses of the Mycenaean period, some of which they share with what would later become the Ionic-Attic dialects, and some which are their own. However, it is difficult to establish a chronology for Aeolic, or resolve the problem of its partial coincidence with Doric.

Before we examine this, let it suffice to say that Boeotia (Thebes, Orchomenus, etc.) as well as Phthia and Iolcos, in Thessaly, have a strong Mycenaean tradition, as attested by archaeology and myth; and that tradition recounts how the conquest of Lesbos was under-

taken by Achilles from Phthia. There are strong links between the dialect of Lesbos and that of eastern Thessaly, Pelasgiotis, and also between the dialects of Thessaly and Boeotia.

It seems that the centre of this dialect was in Thessaly, where, according to myth, King Aeolus ruled and where the name of Aeolia, given to the Asian coast in which this dialect was spoken, originates. Thucydides I 12 writes that the Boeotians were expelled by the Thessalians who, according to Herodotus VII 176, had come from Thesprotia (which Thucydides III 102 calls Aeolia), in the N.W. Balkans. Were the Thessalians Greek Dorians, later partly Aeolicised, as proposed by R. Schmitt 1977, p. 74? Did the Boeotians bring a second-millennium dialect to Boeotia that was more or less evolved in Thessaly, and did they superimpose themselves onto the Mycenaean dominion of that region? Or was it, in contrast, the Dorians who superimposed themselves onto the Aeolian dominion of Thessaly (in the W., Thessaliotis) and Boeotia (especially in the S.W.)? Or did these isoglosses only penetrate by peaceful means?

We will return to this, showing the great diversity that exists within and among these dialects, resulting, no doubt, from both external influences and the absence of a political unity between these regions. However, there are some isoglosses that unify them, although it remains doubtful to what extent they result from a Mycenaean dialect in the whole area or from the modified version of the same appearing in Thessaly and later exported to Boeotia and Lesbos.

122. As I have explained, citing the book by J. L. García Ramón 1975, for this author and others Aeolic has a post-Mycenaean origin. Personally, I have dealt with this topic in depth in Adrados 1976b and I have discussed it earlier (§ 39). I believe that, despite the existence of recent characteristics (although most of them are peculiar to the different dialects), the principal common feature found in Aeolic is that of the ancient isoglosses consisting of archaisms or choices, whether belonging to the whole of EG or only to these dialects (or one of them).

Sometimes, these Aeolic characteristics are also found in Homer and/or in Mycenaean, and they are not Aeolic in these sources: they are simply common to some Aeolic archaisms and choices. There are also archaisms common to Doric, as well as common characteristics, of an older date it seems, with Ionic-Attic and Arcadian, as has been mentioned; other, recent common characteristics unite one dialect with a part of Doric or Attic.

I consider the characteristics common to all of Aeolic, which are rare, to be almost entirely made up of archaisms or ancient, Mycenaean choices: I cannot repeat the argumentation in detail, so I refer the reader to my previous publication as cited. These characteristics are mainly: the vocalisation ορ, ολ; the choice of -μεν as desinence of the 1st pl.; and the patronymic in -ιος. They are characteristics that put Aeolic and Doric in opposition, and approximate, according to each case, Aeolic to EG in general, or to Mycenaean or Homer.

Archaisms and choices, which could be common, are added only in certain dialects: athematic instead of thematic inflection in the verb (more or less diffused in Aeolic, as in Arc.-Cyp. and Homer), thematic inf. -μεν (eastern Thes., Boeot., Hom.), κε (Thes. and Lesb.), πεδά (Boeot., Lesb. and Thes., but here also μετά), -φι (Thes.), πτόλις (Thes.), -οίο, ον-/αν-, μέσποδι (eastern Thes.), ὄνε (Thes. and Arc.-Cyp.), ἐν + Ac. (Boeot., Thes.).

123. With regard to innovations, I have considered those of the second millennium: *k^we > πε-, ρε > ρι, the perf. part. in -οντ-, and the D. pl. in -εσσι (going far beyond Aeolic); see my argumentation in Adrados 1976b, p. 261 ff., and for the last form also J. J. Moralejo 1984 and P. Wathelet 1991. There are also partial innovations, such as the evolution of the nasal or liquid group with *s* or *y* > geminate (Thes., Lesb.), -ντ- > -νθ- (Thes., Boeot.). Not to mention those of the different dialects.

In other words, during the Mycenaean period the Aeolic dialects had already either accepted the archaisms and choices of the rest of EG or adopted new ones. Later on, they introduced some common characteristics through archaism, choice or innovation. But it was never a matter of a perfectly defined dialect, whether in relation to other dialects or internally.

124. Specifically, the Doric innovations (see § 125) did not penetrate Aeolic. Certain characteristics common to Doric and all or part of Aeolic (-τι, -σσ-, *g^wel-, inf.-μεν in athematics, the conditional αἰ, *spiritus asper*, ἐν + Ac., etc.) are but common archaisms (although they could have been introduced secondarily by Dorian peoples or Dorian isoglosses). I have proposed this hypothesis as being the most probable due to the fact that the real innovations of Doric did not penetrate Aeolic (although much earlier, in Adrados 1952, I had referred to transition dialects).

In conclusion, a very divided Aeolic dialect was created on the foundations of para-Mycenean, whether through developments in Boeotia and Thessaly or through developments in Thessaly and later diffusion. It was simultaneously related and in opposition to the rest of the dialects descended from East Greek.

These dialects are known almost exclusively through inscriptions, except for the case of Lesbian and recent Boeotian (Corinna). For reasons that are not entirely clear, a part of these dialects are close to Doric (Boeotian and Thessalian of the Thessaliotis) or to Ionic (Lesbian).

The Doric dialects

125. Once the reality of the Dorian invasion has been established, as it has been in this volume, and once the type of Greek language that it brought with it has been defined as an archaic Greek, little remains to be said about the Doric dialects. It is clear that if there is a coincidence with Homer in τοί, -τί, ἐμίν, etc. or with others with different dialects based on the archaism, this is only a reflection of the common preservation of an archaism, and nothing else. The main problem is whether Doric as such and the so-called N.W. Greek (from Phocian to Elean) are secondary fragmentations within Greece or whether they are a product of older differentiations.

A. Bartoněk 1972 attempted to demonstrate this for a few cases. But the majority view (E. Rich 1985, A. López Eire and J. Méndez Dosuna 1982, J. Méndez Dosuna 1985, and various of my own publications) inclines towards the contrary thesis.

Indeed, the innovations of these dialects are rare: ἐμέος, ἐμίν, αὐτοσαυτόν, τῆνος, the word order in αἴ τίς κα, the generalisation of -ξ- in the fut. and aor. of the verbs in -ζω (a choice), perhaps the act. voice of the pas. fut. (Cret. ἀναγραφήσει), the so-called Doric fut. Sometimes, there are problems regarding the origin of an innovation, as in the case of the D. pl. -εσσι (Doric and Aeolic dialects).

There are also very clear and emphatic examples of choices in the Doric dialects, as compared with EG, no doubt made outside Greece: des. 1st pl. -μες, inf. -μεν, κα; other choices leave traces of the least favoured form, as for example μετά, ὄδε, ποτί, *g^{w}*els*, αἰ.

The N.W. dialects sometimes created clear differentiations, with innnovations such as those of Elean or Laconian. They were developed within Greece, and the same surely applies to those of N.W.

Greek: characteristics such as -σθ > στ, ερ > αρ in addition to others that invaded Aeolic (D. sg. them. -οι, the same and the D. pl. athem. -οις in Boeot.).

126. It should be noted that the arrival of the Dorians gave rise to three different linguistic situations:

(a) A clear, sharp linguistic border, proof of a recent and secondary encounter: as between Attic and Megarian.
(b) Phenomena of the substratum, such as those in Cretan; earlier forms can be seen underlying Doric.
(c) Permeable borders, whether as a result of invasions or simple advances of certain isoglosses (the case of W. Thes. and Boeotian).

The fact is, the Doric dialects barely had a literary development (with exceptions, as we shall see), but the peoples that spoke these dialects were artistically and, above all, politically important in relation to the Ionians. Yet, despite the defeat of Athens in the Peloponnesian War, the city was able to impose its dialect through a complicated process, thus unifying Greece.

4. The unifying isoglosses

127. From the 1950s onwards, it was increasingly demonstrated that, along with the differentiating isoglosses of Greek (of the great dialects and, subsequently, other local dialects), unifying isoglosses began to diffuse: between Doric and Ionic-Attic in general, but also broader or more reduced isoglosses than these, as well as others that crossed local dialectal borders.

This tension between differentiation and unification characterises the evolution of the Greek language from its beginnings. The first unifying example is the development, in the languages spoken in Greece, of isoglosses that partly unified Doric with all or some of its rivals.

This is due to the fact that the common existence of the Greeks, in spite of the brutal chasm caused by the fall of the Mycenaean kingdoms and the Dorian invasion, was slowly restored. I have discussed how the alphabet was diffused almost instantaneously in the eighth century, or perhaps earlier. Dorians and Ionians were rivals in the founding of colonies and in trade. Ceramic styles, from geo-

metric to orientalising and the later ones, reached every point of the globe that was accessible to the Greeks. Styles of architecture and of sculpture were diffused and influenced each other in a reciprocal way. From the eighth century onwards, certain sanctuaries and local oracles began to attract all of the Greeks. Pilgrims, artists and poets began to travel, aristocrats visited each other and established close relations with each other, thereby uniting families: for example, the Alcmæonidæ family and the tyrants of Sicyon. Cities began to overflow with exiles and metics, and their armies sometimes fought side by side: in the Medic Wars, the Peloponnesian Wars, and others. Trade too, and so many other things, enabled close relations to develop.

Then there was literature. Epic was sung everywhere, later iambos, elegy, and lyric, always in languages or dialects penetrated by Homer and with common musical instruments.

In short, there were generally common types of society and politics, although the solutions attempted often varied. Myth and religion also had a unifying function. Thus, Greece, despite its divisions, confrontations and peculiarities, became a cultural unit which sought in vain for a degree of political unity, just like medieval Europe. Historical facts and anecdotes point to a very high degree of reciprocal intellegibility in the sanctuaries, cities, kings' courts (it serves to recall the anecdote about the competition for the wedding of Agariste in Sicyon, in Herodotus VI 126 ff.), and in other places in which various dialects and literary languages were spoken or heard.

128. How, in such a situation, could there not be a convergence of the dialects, particularly when they contained identical or approximate forms? Not just literature, but also administrative documents demanded some kind of standardisation corresponding to the reciprocal approximation of the dialects, since there was a similarity in the form and formulas of the documents.

In the long run, this led to the birth of the international languages, which culminated in the *koine*. But, earlier, it had led to the diffusion of unifying isoglosses that crossed all the dialects.

129. My book of 1952, p. 45, E. Risch 1955, J. Chadwick 1956 and the later bibliography (among others, Adrados 1976b, p. 251, and 1984a, p. 236; A. López Eire and J. Méndez Dosuna 1984) concur with the following: the existence of a series of characteristics common to Doric and EG (and sometimes only to Ion.-Att.) that can

only be attributed to recent innovations or choices. Dates around 1000 BC have been proposed.

For instance, the following characteristics were chosen: αρ (not ορ) in Ion.-At. and Dor., the derivatives of *ens*, -ται not -τοι (this choice reaches Aeol., not Arc.-Cyp.), the types -εύς and -ὅδε (the same observation applies), the thematic conjugation of the denominatives (as in Ion.-At.), etc. Apart from penetrations in the border zone of Aeol., the part of EG which Doric most easily made contact with was Ion-At. (and less frequently, Arc.-Cyp.). We cannot determine exactly through which route this occurred, but it could have been a maritime route or through coexistence in the international world that was being created. It is significant that the same date is attributed to innovations that created inner fragmentations within each of the three great dialects. Included were innovations that crossed borders and created isoglosses shared by dialects that were located in close proximity to each other: the -ττ- of Attic and Boeotian, the ἦνθον of Doric of the Peloponnese in Arcadia and Delphi, the ᾱ before αε in Doric, Aeolic and Boeotian, etc.: I studied these and other examples in Adrados 1952. In addition, there are the Aeolicisms of Asian Ionic, derivatives from the bilingualism of the speakers of these languages. Cf. M.ª P. Hualde 1997.

Of course, sometimes there are doubts, for instance, about the relation between Doric, on the one hand, and Boeotian and Thessalian, on the other; or regarding the proposals by Porzig in favour of borrowings from Ionic to Lesbian (-τι > -σι, εἰς, πρός; cf. against this, A. López Eire 1978b, p. 465, and J. J. Moralejo 1996). Doubts increase in cases where there is a wider diffusion of the isoglosses, such as the D. pl. in -εσσι and the evolution of -ρσ- > -ρρ-, which I discussed in my book of 1952.

It should be noted that physical contact, as it were, between the dialects is not essential for the diffusion of isoglosses: one has to take travel culture into account, as well as relations in general, politics and the epigraphic models.

5. Secondary differences

130. Along with the unifying currents, particularising currents also existed in Greece. As we have seen, neither EG nor WG were perfectly defined and unitary dialects; nor, generally speaking, were

Ionic-Attic, Arcado-Cyprian, Aeolic, or Doric. The differences became more marked as time went by, when the different dialects emigrated to the other side of the sea and when all kinds of oppositions and confrontations emerged (Ionians, then Athenians, and Dorians; within these, Spartans and Argives, etc.). It can be said that in general terms, the most important differences occurred after the expansion of the Ionic-Doric isoglosses around the year 1000; but general rules cannot be provided.

In places with highly organised states, such as Athens, Corinth or Sparta, dialectal units tended to form which, in turn, tended to differentiate themselves strongly from their neighbours. When this was not the case, internal differences emerged: as in Boeotia, Thessaly in particularly, but also in Crete and other parts. The existence of a common dialect has even been the object of debate, as in the case of Saronican. At any rate, Greece became fragmented into a multitude of more or less differentiated dialects, with all kinds of transitions. They tended to be written in different alphabets. As we have seen, most of these dialects never became literary dialects, they were mainly used for internal, colloquial and official purposes.

The whole subject of dialectal fragmentation, which accompanied the diffusion of the unifying isoglosses, has often been the subject of great discussion.

131. Chronology is one of the problems: determining whether N.W. Greek is differentiated secondarily from Doric, within Greece, or whether some differential characteristics came from outside of Greece. As I have noted, some scholars (A. López Eire and A. Negri) believe that Attic and Ionic were two dialects that later unified, which is the opposite of what one would normally think. I have also discussed Pamphylian. Take the doubts regarding the language of Oropus, a place in Attica affected by Attic, Eretrian and Boeotian influences: to what extent are the Eretrian characteristics old or a product of recent contacts? This is no doubt the case of dialectal 'mixtures' as in the Doric region of Asia Minor.

This brings us to the subject of dialectal substrata, which tend to differentiate certain dialects (approximating them, certainly, to others). There are conflicting opinions regarding Doric elements in Boeotian and Thessalian and Ionic elements in Lesbian (cf. §§ 121 f. and 132); and also regarding Mycenaean or Achaean elements, as the case may be, apparently unquestionable, in certain parts of

Crete; I would like to add the Lesbianisms of Ionic in Smyrna, Phocæa, Erithrae and Chios, and, allegedly, Cyrene. Nevertheless, there is a dominant scepticism today with respect to the Ionic elements (or Achaean elements, as we would say today) in the Doric dialect of the Peloponnese, as proposed by A. Tovar 1944, but perhaps it is worth restating the question.

It is impossible to examine these topics in any depth here, I only wish to mention them. The influece of non-Greek languages would have to be added, as in the Ionic of Hipponax of Ephesus, and one would have to show that, due to our limited sources, our knowledge of not only the history of the dialects, but also of the dialects themselves, is very fragmentary.

The case of Ionic demonstrates this most effectively. There is a statement by Herodotus I 142 that the Ionic of Asia was divided into four dialects: but this is not confirmed by literature or the inscriptions, where we only find small differences due to archaism or choice and a few minimal innovations in Chios and Erithrae, and others in Chios and Miletus. Or had a common written language already been created? Yet, we come across differences between Ionic of Asia, of the islands and, naturally, Attic and Euboean.

132. I will not touch upon the subject of the Doric (or supposedly Doric) elements of Thessalian and Boeotian, the Ionic elements of Lesbian, or the subject of Pamphylian.

For the dialectal fragmentation in Thessaly, see R. van der Velde 1924 and J. L. García Ramon 1987; for Saronican (which is questioned), M. E. Pérez Molina 1986; for the problems of Cretan, E. Rizzi 1981, M. Bile 1988, I. Hajnal 1987 and 1988, Y. Duhoux 1988, C. Brixhe 1991a; for those of Lesbian, J. J. Moralejo 1996, C. J. Ruijgh 1995–96; for those of Cyrene, A. Striano 1987 (who questions the substratum); for those of Euboean and Oropus, M. L. del Barrio 1987, 1988, 1994; for the Doric of Asia, W. Blümel 1993; for the subject of the Ionic dialect of Asia, K. Stüber 1996, M. P. Hualde 1997.

Also of useful reference are: for Aeolic, W. Blümel 1982 and R. Hodot 1990a; for Arcadian, A. Lillo 1979, L. Dubois 1983 and C. Cosani 1989; for western Argolic, P. Fernández Alvarez 1981; for N.W. Doric, J. Méndez Dosuna 1985; for Delphian, J. J. Moralejo 1973a; for Aeolic, J. Méndez Dosuna 1980, J. García Blanco 1988 and A. Thévenot-Warelle 1988; for western Locrian, R. García del Pozo 1983; for Laconian, E. Bourguet 1927; for the Doric of Sicily, U. Sicca 1924; For the Ionic of Magnesia, E. Nachmanson 1903; for that of Miletus, B. Bondesson 1936; for that of Erithrae, K. A. Garbrach 1978; for Attic, L. Threatte 1980–1996.

CHAPTER SIX

THE GENERAL LITERARY LANGUAGES: EPIC, ELEGY AND CHORAL LYRIC

1. The literary languages as general languages

133. The unifying tendencies within the Greek dialects, of a very ancient date, have been discussed; so too, the social and cultural forces that stimulated this approximation, which grew progressively until the Attic dialect was imposed, in its *koine* variant, as the general language of the Greeks.

So, a factor which contributed decisively to the mutual understanding of the Greeks and to the approximation of the dialects was the creation of more or less general literary languages that were understood by everyone in the cultural sphere. First, there were poetic general languages: the Homeric language, that of elegy and choral lyric. Then, the particular languages that were nevertheless understood in all parts: Ionic, Lesbian and some others. Finally, the languages of prose, first Ionic (which was on the brink of becoming a general language), then Attic (which succeeded in doing so).

There are degrees of generality, so to speak. If a poet from any part of Greece, a speaker of any dialect, sat down to compose poetry of the epic kind, or one of the related genres, he would do so in the Homeric language. From a certain point in history, any poet who composed elegies would do so in the language of elegy; and the choral poets, in the language of choral lyric. In contrast, other poetic genres were written only in restricted territories, mainly in the local language, whereas the genres of which I have just spoken were composed, sung, heard and imitated everywhere. The same occurred with the diffusion of Ionic and Attic prose.

134. Hesiod, a Boeotian, wrote in the epic language of Homer, as did the authors of the Epic Cycle poems, such as Stasinus of Cyprus or Arctinus of Miletus, and the poets of the so-called Homeric Hymns, recited in Delos, Delphi and other parts. Indeed, Homer was recited in the Athens of Pisistratus, in the Sicyon of Cleisthenes and practically

everywhere. Ceramic pottery attests to the knowledge of Homer at least from the ninth century onwards, and the oldest inscriptions starting from the one on the cup of Pithecusæ, are influenced by him (cf., *Iliad* XI 632–637).

Similarly, epigraphy gives evidence that elegies were written everywhere: sometimes, first in the local dialects and then in the general language of elegy. Indeed, the Sicilian Stesichorus, the Boeotian Pindar, the Ionians Simonides and Bacchylides, and the Attic tragedians all composed their poems in the language of choral lyric.

Of course, these languages admitted modifications and evolutions, as well as major or minor influences from the language of the poets: for example, the case of the tragedy from Attic. But they were essentially unitary. It is notable that the oldest language – the Homeric language, as it was written in the eighth century – influenced them all. It influenced elegy, iambos, choral lyric, the monody of Sappho and Alcaeus, even the Ionic of Herodotus. Subsequently, Ionic influenced literary Attic.

135. It should be noted that Homer, with the Ionic and Aeolic linguistic forms that had penetrated his language (and the old forms that were interpreted in this way), helped to make certain dialects comprehensible. Likewise, these dialects were penetrated by Homerisms as a natural development, in so far as they looked like a continuation of Homer.

Even the Ionic philosophers were influenced by Homer when creating their new intellectual lexicon. Thus, due to his diffusion and influence in the various literary languages, Homer was an important factor in the linguistic unification of Greece. Given that Aeolic was relegated to Lesbos and a small region of Asia, first Ionic and later Attic, as opposed to Doric, became the true successors of Homer. Homer gave Attic legitimacy, for instance in the case of the Macedonians and even the Dorians, and he helped to impose it.

From different geographic areas in Greece the literary languages, which modified the local dialects with the aid of linguistic forms with great diffusion, opened increasingly larger areas to intellectual and cultural communication, as well as just plain communication between the Greeks. There was a cumulative process, which relegated many dialects to simple languages for internal use.

All of this resulted in the imposition of Attic, favoured by historical circumstances, although not as the general language of prose (the old forms remained in use for poetry) but as the general language in the everyday life of the Greeks. The unity that had been broken within East Greek in the second millennium was now reconstructed.

2. The first general language: epic language in our Homer

Innovations in epic language

136. As we have seen, there is an epic language of the second millennium, proceeding from a long evolution of the Indo-European epic language and subjected to an evolutionary process of which we know very little, and another epic language of the eighth century, when Homer wrote or dictated his poems. It is significant that the epic language tradition, known to us through Homer, was not the only one that existed. Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns and even the lyrics bring oral traditions to mind that are somewhat different. Furthermore, our Homer of the eighth century suffered some alterations in transmission which to a certain extent have disfigured him in our eyes.

However, leaving the background, parallels and later alterations aside for a moment, the fact is that the literary language of the eighth century, of our Homer, was soon known and imitated in the entire Greek world.

137. It is a well-known fact this epic language was an artificial language, not the actual dialect of a particular place, and that it was much conditioned by metre and formal diction. Traditionally, it has been analysed by two, not always clear, schemes: the first opposes archaic/recent/artificial forms, and the second opposes Aeolic (sometimes, earlier, Achaean)/Ionic. Our analysis will be a bit different: the forms that descend from the second millennium cannot be classified as Achaean, Aeolic or Ionic. This has been considered in a previous chapter, and the relevant bibliography was also provided.

We can only classify them as archaic forms, sometimes occurring in doublets, which are sometimes artificial and, indeed, are very

conditioned by metre, which forces the choice between -σ-/-σσ-, ἄν/κε, etc.

In contrast, forms (phonetic or morphological) that were only consolidated in the first millennium are Ionic and Aeolic: such as the evolution of *k^we- > πε (Aeolic) or τε (Ionic), the pers. pron. of the 2nd Ac. pl. ὔμμε (Aeolic)/ὑμέας (Ionic, but aspirated), the evolution of ᾱ > η (Ionic, like the contractions, metathesis of quantity, etc.), with the observation that ᾱ and the previous forms are not Aeolicisms but archaisms.

138. Naturally, the exact date of an innovation cannot be fixed in all cases, but it is clear that Aeolicisms and Ionicisms did exist: they are the innovations or choices of these dialects in the first millennium. I have presented my theory: if in this recent date the archaic forms κε, -ορ-, -εσσι, the ϝ (and its occasional derivative -υ-) were interpreted as Aeolicisms, this would open the way for the entry of 'new Aeolicisms'; at first, whenever they were needed, since the contemporary language rejected certain archaisms; then, indiscriminately. For it is a characteristic of epic language and of epos in general to absorb recent cultural and linguistic forms, without shrinking before doublets or contradictions.

The same applies to the Ionicisms, given that, as mentioned earlier, forms such as ἄν, εἰ, -ναι and so many others were interpreted as Ionicisms. But it is significant that, as I also mentioned earlier, some forms from epic language of the second millennium could, in themselves, be classified as Achaeanisms (especially lexical forms) or Doricisms: τοί, inf. -μεν, etc. Nevertheless, 'recent' forms of Arc.-Cyp. or Doric (for example, ἐμέος) have not entered our Homer.

This means that the Homeric language grew in an environment in which only Aeolic (essentially, that of Lesbian and of Asia) and Ionic (also of Asia: there are but a few rare Atticisms, no doubt as a result of the transmission) were known and accepted as literary languages; perhaps in the region of Asia Minor around Smyrna, where the two dialects coexisted, as proposed by Wilamowitz and supported by C. J. Ruijgh 1995–96, who proposes the existence of Ionic influences in Aeolic.

From our point of view, the important thing is that the local dialects were rejected in the entire Greek world when it came to writing about elevated, mythical or philosophical themes, in favour of this artificial and traditional language with greater prestige. The

Homeric language was associated with these themes, without any limitations of time and space. Since each dialect, including the Doric dialects, found some of its own forms in the Homeric language, it was at the same time both familiar and strange to them, intelligible and obscure, like all religious and literary languages in general. Thus, differing from the everyday language, it provided a base for the creation of the general literary languages which shall be discussed.

139. Another topic of interest is the relative chronology of Aeolic and Ionic elements. Among the latter, there are very recent examples, such as the new ᾱ that penetrated the Homeric language after the ᾱ > η evolution had taken place: πᾶς, κᾱλός; and there is a lack of recent Lesbianisms such as παῖσα.

This is not a conclusive fact. Nevertheless, there are arguments to suggest that although the successive strata of the second millennium are pure fantasy, the Aeolic forms of the first millennium generally entered before the Ionic forms. The Aeolic forms replaced the archaic forms; the Ionic forms replaced the archaic forms preserved (or not) by Aeolic, and often the Aeolic forms, although they also mixed indiscriminately at a certain point. Also, at times, neither of them were sufficient, so that artificial forms were introduced. But I will return to this.

Formulaic diction and the renovation of epic language

140. I must first add something to what has already been stated about the formulaic diction that dominates the tradition of the Indo-European and Greek epic. In principle, there is a criterion of economy: a single person or action requires the same formula in the same metrical space, and different formulas in different metrical spaces; and actions or things (behaviour, weapons, locations, etc.) can have identical formulas wherein words having the same metrical scheme substitute each other. One formula has other parallel formulas when we go from the N. to other cases, from one person to another, etc. Thus, it would seem to be a closed, mechanical system, which is how Parry described it; a system that is, in principle, barely permeable to linguistic evolution.

In fact, sometimes linguistic evolution does not affect the formulaic system: for instance, when the labiovelar is substituted by labial or dental results or when *φθέργω is substituted by φθέρρω or φθείρω or -μᾱν by μήν or -εε- by -ει- (where metre accepts double short as

well as long) or Πηληϊάδᾱ' Ἀχιλῆος by Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος. Whether an Aeolic or Ionic form is introduced depends on criteria that have nothing to do with the formulaic system. On the condition that neither the formulaic system nor the metre is altered; a preferred linguistic element is introduced because it is contemporary. Indeed, a mixture of archaism and innovation is preferred in the epic.

In contrast, recent forms which destroyed this system or metre were, in principle, blocked: for example, -σαν of the 3rd pl. sec. in Ionic. But if certain contemporary forms that were not blocked by the formulaic system managed to enter, this produced a tension when other modern forms were unable to enter.

141. In effect, the formulaic system was subjected to the pressure of new lexical and grammatical forms, and also of the forms that were not accepted into the formulaic transformations: a formula in N. πατρὶς ἄρουρα cannot be transformed into a formula of G. *πατρίδος ἀρούρης because the metre does not allow it (the poet must say πατρίδος αἴας). Also, transforming a formula which contains a verb in a certain tense or mood to another with a different tense or mood, or changing the adjective of a nominal formula or elaborating, reducing, or changing the metrical position of a formula can produce problems because certain contemporary forms and words are avoided.

This was gradually resolved through the adaptation of the formulas: the creation of new formulas that favoured both poetic creation and the introduction of new linguistic material. A. Hoekstra 1969 described recent formulas for forms without digamma or with ephelcystic -ν or with various linguistic, stylistic and metrical peculiarities. J. B. Hansworth 1968 has written extensively on the flexibility of the formula: it can change position, be reduced, widened, can divide into two, etc. The book by P. Chantraine 1942 acutely describes the problem of the new forms and metrical schemes, showing that there is adaptability.

142. Yet, the formulaic system is not absolutely economic, as alternative formulas can be created, see P. Edwards 1971, p. 55 ff. Also, authors such as H. Patzer 1972, G. S. Kirk 1976, J. M. Bremer 1987, B. Peabody 1975 have shown very clearly that the poet uses the formulaic system very skillfully, and that it is not simply mechanical. This applies equally whether we accept that Homer dictated his poems or believe that he wrote them. In any case, this modification of the formulaic systems and the introduction of new forms into them has been a gradual process, a continuation of a very old evolution, not just a case of one individual poet. Cf. also

P. Chantraine 1942, p. 27 ff., L. Palmer 1980, p. 80 ff., M. Leumann 1950.

143. The epic language of our Homer, the end point of that long evolution, is recognisable once we take away the thin covering that the later tradition left on it. It displays a fundamentally Ionic aspect, and includes Aeolic forms, as well as some artificial ones, others archaic. It must be emphasised that the latter should not be given dialectal denominations, in spite of the fact that they were understood in this way by the poets who introduced the true Aeolicisms and Ionicisms and, without doubt, by their listeners; the same applies to the ancient grammarians (and, sometimes, modern linguists).

This fundamentally Ionic character, as I explained in § 135, opened the way in Greece for the prestige and understanding of Ionic and for the subsequent expansion of Attic.

But in this context, it should be recalled how the innovations of these two dialects penetrated the epic language of the second millennium, as it passed into the first millennium, without forgetting the archaisms and doublets which could be interpreted as being from one or the other dialect.

Obviously, whenever the phonological system had been transformed (a phoneme or a group was no longer admissible), it had to be replaced by the new one, as in the case of the labiovelars. In Homer, we find Ionic phonetics in τέσσερες, τεῖσαι, τέλος, etc. (and τ- is common to the two dialects in τις, τέο) but Aeolic phonetics in πέλωρ (τέλωρ is just a gloss of Hesychius), πέλομαι (beside τέλλομαι, etc.), πίσυρες (beside τέσσερες). From the **ghw-* group, we have θήρ and φήρ (in relation to centaurs). It is clear that Ionic and Aeolic competed with each other to impose their phonetics when a phoneme or combination of phonemes was no longer possible. Similarly, in the results of **sm-*: ἄμμες/ἡμεῖς (metrical equivalents before a consonant).

However, sporadically, an archaism alternating with an innovation could be preserved: ἔκερσεν, but ἀπεκείρατο (Ionic) and ὀφέλλειεν (Aeol. opt. aor.).

144. The problem is the relation between archaic forms, on the one hand, and Aeolic and Ionic forms, on the other. To begin with, it is evident that the archaic forms (pseudo-Achaean or pseudo-Aeolic) were difficult to substitute for Aeolic or Ionic forms when they did not coincide metrically and, additionally, when they were too representative of epic poetry. For instance, in the case of pseudo-

Achaean or pseudo-Arcado-Cyprian lexicon (ἄναξ, αἶσα, φάσγανον, etc.) and in pseudo-Aeolic morphological forms such as κε, θυρᾱ́ων, παίδεσσι, ἔσσεται, etc.: that is, in the remnants of second-millennium EG, which did not need adjectives. Here, neither Ionic nor Aeolic forms (the real ones, from the first millennium) could enter when they differed.

In the case of non-alteration of the metre, a choice could be made between an Aeolic or Ionic form, as we have seen: the reasons for this are not exactly known, there was certainly in some cases an ancient Aeolic tradition, as in φῆρες, 'centaurs', and perhaps in other forms.

The case of Ionic forms, by far the most frequent, is different, as we know. Examples have been provided in which they replaced other identical archaic forms from a metrical and formulaic perspective; and others in which the metre did not allow them (there is Ποσειδᾱ́ων, but not Ποσειδέων) or in which they would form a doublet with other forms (archaic or Aeolic) when they were metrically equivalent (ἄν/κε, ὑμεῖς/ἄμμες, -σ-/-σσ-).

The most interesting case, however, is when an archaic form is replaced by nothing other than an equivalent Ionic form, whether regularly or not. For example, η is introduced for ᾱ (but not always: there is ἵλᾱος, πολύτλᾱς); Ac. pl. in -ους (< -ονς): in this case, without an Aeolic alternative.

But recent Aeolic forms could in fact enter when this did not involve an alteration of the metre, as in some examples already mentioned and ἄχευε (for ἄχεϝϝε), perf. part. -οντες (for -ῶτες), ζα- (for *dya-).

145. Nevertheless, sometimes the Ionicisms involved metrical alterations that were tolerated: if two breves are contracted, this means that now the foot is an spondee and not a dactyl (uncontracted forms still existed). But beyond this the fall of a digamma may produce the creation of a hiatus in principle antimetric (similarly, for example, οἱ, αἱ instead of τοί, ταί); the metathesis of -ηο- (which is sometimes preserved, αἰζηός) in -εω- involves the alteration of the metre; etc. Although, on occasion, the restitution of the ancient form has been proposed: for example, in the case of Πηληϊαδέω (for -ᾱ, as cited previously) and those of *Il.* V 21 ἀδελφειοῦ κταμένοιο (for -εόο), *Od.* X 60 Αἰόλου κλυτὰ δώματα (for -οο), *Il.* IX 64 ἐπιδημίου ὀκρυοέτος (for -ίοο κρ-).

The most serious are those cases in which, as mentioned earlier, the Ionicisms implied a clear alteration in metre and, therefore, a need for new formulas. I cited the 3rd pl. sec. -σαν beside the archaic form -εν. Many other forms can be added: apart from those related to the contractions, metathesis and other phenomena relating to vowels (which left numerous examples of archaic use), morphological forms of the type N. pl. ὑμεῖς, ἡμεῖς when followed by a vowel (against **yusmés* or **yuhmés*, Aeol. ὔμμες and similarly in the 1st pers.), and Ac. pl. in -έας.

It would seem then that at a certain point there was conflict between, on the one hand, the archaism and the new form, and on the other hand, in this second case, between Aeolicism and Ionicism. At one point, certainly in a more archaic date, both dialects competed with each other and sometimes one, sometimes the other would triumph, although Aeolic generally had the advantage (but mixed forms were created of the type ἤμβροτε); Aeolic (that is, the recent Aeolic, which is the true Aeolic) does not seem to have altered metre. Later, Ionic began to triumph with greater frequency, but without eliminating the archaic or Aeolic forms completely. This process was linked to the renovation of the formulas. The frequency of Ionic, its stronger corrosive effect on the formulaic tradition, and its inclusion of very recent forms shows that if Aeolicim and Ionicism had coexisted at some point, it was Ionicism that later imposed itself.

More on the epic language of the eighth century

146. The history of epic language can be studied from the successive renovations, which together with the archaic core, introduced contemporary forms. However, it is an entirely different thing to establish how the language as a whole was understood by contemporaries (of the eighth century, that is), ancient grammarians and by modern linguists.

It was undoubtedly known that the epic language, apart from purely Ionic forms, contained anomalies, among which there were all kinds of hesitations and doublets. These anomalous forms were usually interpreted as Aeolicisms, some as Achaeanisms by certain modern linguists; this interpretation was marred by the idea that Homer displayed a mixture of dialects of the first millennium. Indeed many of his forms, the most archaic, were neither Ionicisms nor

Aeolicisms in the second millennium, although they would have been so in the first millennium.

Nevertheless, it must be stressed that many of these anomalous forms (whether archaic or recent) were really artificial forms, resulting from the adaptation to metre of forms that did not fit into it.

Actually, the date of some of these artificial adaptations is sometimes difficult to establish: as, for instance, ἡνιοχῆα (for -χον), ποντοπορεύω (for -έω), ἀνόστιμος (for ἄνοστος); or metrical enlargements such as ἀθάνατος, δυσᾱέος, ἀπειρέσιος, οὔρεα, etc. Some presuppose certain recent phenomena: for instance, *diectasis* (ἡβώοντες, ἡβάασθε) represents a transaction between the contraction and the desire to maintain the ancient metrical scheme.

In any case, there is an attempt to avoid the tribrach (three short syllables) and the cretic (long-short-long), which do not fit into the hexameter. The epic tradition does not hesitate in introducing false forms. I have shown how, at times, beneath these forms there could be archaic regular forms: for example, φοινικόεις with ī probably substituted φοινικϝεντ-.

147. Furthermore, the epic poets could misinterpret the words of their ancestors: this was highlighted by M. Leumann 1950 with regard to the interpretation of Homer by the Hellenistic poets, and also with regard to misinterpretations within the epic tradition. For example, terms such as κύμβαχος 'the top of the helmet' (*Il.* XV 536), later understood as 'of the head' (of a person, *Il.* V 586); or παρήορος 'tied at the side', referring to the exterior carthorse (*Il.* XVI 471), later interpreted as 'scattered, with outstretched arms' (*Il.* VII 156). All of this is evidence of an evolution within the epic tradition.

For the listeners, these forms, together with the archaisms (interpreted sometimes as Ionic or Aeolic, but also simply as epic) and the doublets merely formed part of the characteristics of the epic language. The exercise of choice was not entirely free, for metre and the formulas made their presence and influence felt; but they were rather susceptible to modification. An Ionic that was blended and modified in this way was understood as an epic language and, as such, was recited and listened to in all the corners of Greece. We have an idea of what it was like in the second millennium and what it must have looked like in the first millennium.

148. However, the epic language of the eighth century, the language of Homer, has not reached us intact. At the very least, we should

draw attention to the effects of the shift from the initial Greek alphabet to the later Ionic alphabet; and to its journey through the Attic tradition and Alexandrine editions.

Among other things, the letters *E* and *O* in the primitive Greek alphabet designated each what would later become three vowels: ε/ει/η and ο/ου/ω. Thus, lengthenings such as those mentioned earlier could be prosodic, but not graphic. ΕΟΣ could be interpreted in various ways: ἦος, εἶος, ἕως. Furthermore, ξεῖνος, ἠγνοίσεν were not written with -ει- and η-, nor there were forms with *diectasis*. Indeed, since gemination went unnoticed, it is doubtful whether Ionic forms such as κείρω, ἀλγειονός and Aeolic forms such as ὀφέλλω, ἐραννός were introduced by the pre-Homeric poets or simply by subsequent copyists.

Then we have the Atticisms (which are rare and much debated) that must have penetrated the text during the period in which it was copied and diffused in Athens (after Pisistratus, according to tradition). The following forms are generally considered to be Attic: κεῖντο against Ionic κείατ'; also, φεροίη, φιλοίη and a few others.

Nevertheless, these and a few other forms, including the proliferation of contractions, metathesis of quantity, lengthenings, diectasis, etc. can also be attributed to the editions by Aristarchus and the other Alexandrine philologists. This subject will not be examined here. In any case, the fundamental characteristics of the epic language from Homer's own mouth, so to speak, in the eighth century are very clear. Here, we have attempted, on the one hand, to establish their origin, and on the other hand, the interpretation they received.

3. The diffusion of the first general language: the language of hexametric poetry after Homer

General overview

149. Homer represents a key, divisive moment in the evolution of the Greek epic, in which it achieved a written form and produced great poems of a dramatic kind in the language that we have studied. Epic poetry had existed before Homer, and poems such as *Memnoneia* or *Achilleid* and *Meleagria* have even been cited as having influenced the *Iliad*. It is important to note that the human and divine epic (the conflict between the gods) is accompanied in Homer

by traces of cosmogonic poetry (*Il.* XIV 200 ff. and 274 ff., XV 185 ff.), by hymns and prayers to the gods, and by maxims and didactic elements (cf. *Il.* XXIII 542, *Od.* I 132 ff., etc.).

After Homer, still within the archaic and classical period, there is a continuation of hexametric poetry:

(a) Firstly, there is Hesiod, who is placed in the same century (eighth), a little after Homer (he is placed before the *Odyssey* by some) and who, in his principal poems, *Theogony, Works and Days, The Shield*, and *Catalogue of Women*, writes cosmogonic poetry, genealogy, divine and heroic epic, hymns, with the first two genres predominating.
(b) Secondly, the epic, which is brought together under the concept of the *Epic Cycle*: a series of poems with various themes (above all, Theban and Trojan themes, themes relating to the return of heroes, Heracles, etc.) which are dated between the seventh and sixth centuries: the most cited being the *Cypria* by Stasinus of Cyprus, the Aethiopis by Arctinus of Miletus, the *Little Iliad* by Lesches of Pyrrha or Miletus, and the works of Eumelus of Corinth, Panyassis of Halicarnassus and Choerilus of Samos. The problem for the study of the language is the terribly fragmented state in which these poems have been handed down to us.
(c) Thirdly, the hymns: the so-called anonymous *Homeric Hymns*, which are dated from the seventh century onwards. Also, the hexametric prayer of Solon 28.
(d) Fourthly, the philosophic hexametric poems, derived from cosmogonic and didactic poetry: by Xenophanes of Colophon (VI/V), Parmenides (V), Empedocles (V); also, the maxims of Phocylides (VI). In sum, a relatively small number of hexameters.
(e) Finally, parody is represented by the *Batracomyomachia*, the battle of the frogs and the mice, which today is often attributed to the Hellenistic period. Cf. also Hipponax 135.

150. All of these genres, including the last, continued to be cultivated in the Hellenistic period; and the epic above all during the Roman period, although philosophy began to be written in prose in the same century (the sixth). So, all this hexametric poetry follows the language of Homer very closely, and this also applies to mixed hexametric poetry (a combination of the hexameter and pentameter in the elegy, with the catalectic trochaic tetrameter in the *Margites*,

various combinations of dactylic elements in Archilochus, etc.), which will be discussed in §§ 155 ff. The great diffusion of Homerisms throughout Greek poetry and even Ionic prose comes from these genres.

By focusing only on pure hexametric poetry, it can be said that it maintained the essence of the Homeric language and that it was a fundamental element in the development of Greek poetry and thought. To a large extent, it continued Homeric themes, as we have seen, although Hesiod and other authors place greater emphasis on particular themes.

Nevertheless, there are sufficient differences to warrant some explanation, especially since theories have emerged according to which the language of Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns has a different origin, at least in part, from that of Homer. In general, I would say that the characteristics of the new epic language display a degree of modernisation, an adaptation to themes, and a slight approximation, at times, to the local dialects of the poets.

All of this poetry – like Homer himself, we assume – proceeds from Asia Minor: from there it spread to Boeotia (Hesiod came from Cyme), Sicily (Xenophanes came from Colophon), Corinth (Eumelus), Athens (Solon, perhaps the *Hymn to Demeter*).

The different genres

151. There is a whole theory proposing that Hesiod and the *Homeric Hymns* correspond to a western, not Homeric, epic tradition: the Homerisms would be a result of a later transmission. There has been much discussion regarding a series of Hesiodic forms, in particular, which are considered Boeotian, Doric, or simply 'western'; sometimes this tradition is identified with one that is thought to have also been at the base of Aeolic poetry. But I will return to this later.

The discussion centres on some forms that are rather doubtful: Ac. pl. -ᾰς, -ος in the 1st and 2nd declensions (ante-consonantal forms preferred in Thes., Arc., and the western dialects); athematic 'Aeolic' verbs, absent from Homer (for example, αἴνημι), τέτορα (the only clear Doricism), ἄψιν (supposedly Aeolic), G. pl. μελιᾶν (Dor. or Aeol.), ἔδον, ἦν (supposedly Doric, but probably archaisms), κᾰλός (At. or western). The degree of modernisation or avoidance of archaisms is great, but sometimes there is a drop in frequency.

As mentioned before, there is much debate about this and today there is a tendency to incline towards scepticism. For me, these non-Homeric forms are a recent introduction – whether from Aeolic (in which territory Hesiod originated), Boeotian or the West – and a slight local influence, such as that of Ionic in Homer, would not have been strange; nor, for example, would it have been strange had Hesiod preserved some archaism not found in Homer.

The most characteristic feature of the language of Hesiod is its modernisation: the reduction of the frequency of archaisms. The loss of the digamma, for example, is more frequent than in Homer, even though it is preserved in Boeotian.

152. For the precedents of Homer, see Adrados in AA.VV. 1984, p. 80 ff. For an analysis of the work of Hesiod see Adrados 1986c. The *Cycle* is edited by A. Bernabé 1996, and Antimachus of Colophon (fifth and sixth century) must be added in particular.

As far as the system of formulas is concerned, it is logical that Hesiod uses a different series than Homer: formulas linked to cosmogonic and genealogic but also didactic topics. Curiously, some of them coincide with those of the Homeric Hymns. There is a good collection of data in F. Kraft 1963 and a series of conclusions in J. de Hoz 1964; I drew my own conclusions in an article (Adrados 1986c), in which I proposed the existence of this kind of oral poetry in Greece (cosmogonic, genealogic, religious, didactic, poetry) which was thematically influenced by well-known models from Eastern literature (Mesopotamic and Egyptian), but which had developed those formulaic systems within Greece.

Evidently, hexametric oral poems flourished. Our Homer followed the central epic line, but others could contain formulaic and lexical systems that were partly different. Of course, the poets of the first millennium could broaden or modify these systems and also copy each other. It is very clear, with respect to the lexicon, that Hesiod included much colloquial and technical agricultural lexicon, cf. H. Troxler 1964, p. 240 ff. There is also another lexicon that coincides with that of the *Hymns*, cf. R. Hiersche 1970, p. 101. The philosophical poets had to create a vocabulary fit to express their thought, cf. R. Hiersche 1970, p. 104 ff. I will return to this subject when I look at the creation of the Greek intellectual lexicon.

The history of the subject of the language of Hesiod and the *Hymns* can be found in H. Rodríguez Somolinos 1998a, p. 15 ff. The idea of a 'continental epic' (with a confused mixture of Doric and Aeolic elements) comes from A. Hoekstra 1957, and was elaborated, in exaggerated terms, by C. O. Pavese 1972 and 1974 (but see p. 111 ff. on the recent elements). A very clear and decisively sceptic study is provided by G. P. Edwards 1971, cf. also R. Hiersche 1970, p. 99 ff. and L. R. Palmer 1980, p. 101 ff. For R. Janko 1982, Hesiod is purely Homeric. For a rejection of 'Doricisms', cf. A. Morpurgo 1964. For the language of the oracles, cf. J. A. Fernández Delgado 1986.

There are parallel conclusions regarding the *Hymns*, in which the modernisation of the language predominates. According to A. Hoekstra 1969, the language and style of the *Homeric Hymns* is essentially derived from Homer, although it may contain some archaisms. There are even misunderstood Homeric expressions. Also, the Atticisms are centred on the *Hymn to Demeter*, perhaps of Attic origin. Cf. O. Zumbach 1955.

153. So, this and the succeeding poetry inherited certain themes, a lexicon and formulaic expressions from the second millennium: whether the same as in Homer or different. However, the small differences that can be found in the language are the result of a recent evolution which tended to reduce archaisms and, in rare cases, introduced local forms, as had occurred in Homer. In short, it was the Homeric language, in a more or less updated form, which became the literary language in the whole of Greece by means of hexametric poetry and the elegy derived from it.

These conclusions, based on Hesiod and the *Hymns*, can hardly be modified with the study of the minimal remains of the *Cycle*. In these and in the Hellenistic epic and that of the Roman period, the language of Homer remained more or less intact.

With respect to philosophical hexametric poetry, it must be stressed that it essentially offered the same language, nearly always eliminating exclusively Homeric and not Ionic forms. However, modifications are admitted, and not just in the lexicon and the formulas. The philosophers take great liberties: in Xenophanes, we find the D. pl. σπεάτεσσι, the infinitive φῦν; Empedocles prefers γέντο (Hes.), creates θαλείοις from θάλεια, etc. Sometimes, archaic and recent forms alternate; and as mentioned earlier, new meanings are given to the lexicon, as in cases such as ἐόν (Parm.) and φιλότης (Emp.).

154. The language of these authors was essential for the later evolution of the philosophical and intellectual lexicon, but we will deal with this in a later section, cf. §§ 227 ff.; but also with the rhetorical language and the Attic prose of Gorgias, cf. A. Traglia 1952, p. 41 ff., on Empedocles. These poets, following Homeric phraseology to a large exent, were at the same time great creators.

4. The second general language: the language of elegy and epigram

Elegy

155. The study of the first general language of the first millennium has been completed: Homeric and epic language. The second general language, that of elegy, is derived from the first.

Of course, this are not the appropriate place to study the origins of elegy, which are in any case much debated. It is a fact that from the seventh century onwards we come across – in the Ionic world but also in the Doric and subsequently in all of Greece – poems in elegiac distics, a slight variation of the hexametric rhythm given that the hexameter is followed by a pentameter: this is called the *elegeíon*, a derivative of the *élegos*, which for some scholars means a 'lament' and comes from Phrygia.

Indeed, because there is variation in the metre there is also variation in the language, although not of a radical kind: we are dealing with an Ionicised epic language, or Ionic language influenced by epic; and with poems sung to the music of the flute. For instance, in Callinus and Archilochus in the seventh century. There is also variation in the content. We have a mythic or mythic-historic elegy in Mimnermus and Antimachus, among others, but usually it is a lyric in the first person which adresses a second person: urging them to war, politics or a particular conduct, thinking or expressing feelings – all of this took place at banquets, at funerary rituals or various events (for example at the Pythian Games), before an assembly or the army, etc. Thus, there was a need for a more agile rhythm and a more agile and more accessible language as well.

It was in Ionia, as mentioned, that, from the middle of the seventh century onwards, various popular genres passed into the hands of the poets, receiving the new rhythms, execution and language: the Ionicised epic, as I mentioned. Tyrtaeus in Sparta, Solon in Athens, Theognis in Megara and others (allegedly Sacadas in Argolis in the seventh/sixth century, but no fragments remain) followed this model: the language of the elegy became, I must stress, the second 'general language' of Greece. So much so that elegiac distics were composed by all kinds of personalities. In the fifth century, elegiac distics were composed not only by elegiac poets such as Euenus of Paros, Ion of Chios, Antimachus of Colophon, Dionysius Chalcus

and Critias of Athens, but also by Simonides, Bacchylides, Anacreon, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Plato, Aristotle, Crates (at times, of dubious authenticity). And there is a legion of elegiacs in the Hellenistic period.

156. There is some confusion between elegy and epigram. The latter term simply indicated an inscription, such as those at the end of the eighth century, as we saw, whether in prose or verse: the aim was to transmit news or a message (an epitaph, dedication, owner, etc.) in a short and succinct form. In Homer, we find evidence of funerary steles or dedications of weapons to a god, but the Phoenician inscriptions, with their content as well as their alphabet, had the greatest influence in Greece.

The most ancient inscriptions in verse are hexametric: Homer was the model in hand when it came to writing in a solemn way. But from the year 500 onwards, elegiac distic predominates; epigraphs are anonymous until approximately 350 BC, although Simonides already composed epigrams as did, later, the poets previously mentioned.

With respect to the language, it has to be said that the epigram was first written in the local dialects, always with the influence of the Homeric language; but soon it became contaminated with the language of elegy and, at a certain point, there was no longer any linguistic distinction (since the borders between the two genres are blurred).

157. For archaic elegy, see Adrados 1990a, B. Gentili–C. Prato 1979–85, M. L. West 1989 (E. Diehl 1950 is still useful today); for epigram see P. A. Hansen 1983 and the great collection of metrical inscriptions of W. Peek 1955, as well as various other collections. On the origin of the genres, see, in addition to what I say in the Introduction to Adrados 1990a, the various dissertations included in the volume by AA.VV. 1969; among them, that by A. E. Raubitschek regarding 'Das Denkmal-Epigramm' and that by B. Gentili, 'Epigramma ed elegia' (against the threnetic origin of the latter and about the blurred limits with the epigram). On the language, different works in this volume, in AA.VV. 1963 on Archilochus (above all, A. Scherer and D. Page) as well as B. Kock 1910, B. Snell 1969, O. Hoffmann 1973, p. 102 ff., R. Hiersche 1970, p. 106 ff., L. R. Palmer 1980, p. 105 ff., among others.

158. Let us begin with the elegy, whose prime representative, Callinus – who differs little from Archilochus – transformed the Homeric heroes' discourses into exhortations to his citizens to fight against the

Cimmerians. It should be pointed out that the elegies of both writers are essentially epic, although the features that are distant from Ionic have generally been eliminated. In contrast, other features are perfectly preserved, such as those which are at the same time both epic and Ionic, for example, μουσέων and other forms without contraction, εὖτ', ἄν, the loss of digamma leaving a hiatus, etc. Yet Aeolicisms such as πίσυρες, ἀργεννός, ἄμμες do not appear. Certain non-Ionic Homeric forms are, exceptionally, found linked to Homeric formulas and metre: for example, the G. in -οιο, τόσσον, κάλλιπον (Arch.), κεν, λαῷ, ὁππότε (Call.). Yet archaic forms and words disappear.

Contemporary Ionic rarely enters: κοτ' and κως appear in Callinus, and there is much discussion regarding δορί (< *-ρϝ-) in Archilochus, which is considered to be Attic by some, also insular Ionic by others. -επονήθη, ἔσκε, etc. and much of the lexicon is not epic.

It is very clear that Archilochus's elegies are full of epic formulas, as has been clearly shown by D. Page 1963 and L. R. Palmer 1980; but the latter describes the introduction of new popular vocabulary.

159. We do not come across great differences in the case of Tyrtaeus, who exhorted the Lacedaemonians to fight against the Messenians. We do not know whether he was Laconian or, as others would have it, Milesian or Athenian, but in any case, his language was understood in Sparta. He uses Ionic -η, some recent Ionicisms such as ψυχέων, most times ignores ϝ (which was preserved in Laconian!), uses epic forms such as βασιλῆας, κᾱλά, φεῦγον (and some which are also Laconian, such as λᾱός), but there is once again a lack of archaic or Aeolic epic forms that are absent from Ionic. A small number of Doricisms enter, particularly in the Ac. pl. in -ᾰς of the 1st decl. and κακκείμενος.

Consequently, Tyrtaeus is full of Homeric formulas, some of which have sometimes altered in meaning, as in Archilochus.

The scene is always the same: an epic language in which the most archaic or strange elements are eliminated, apart from formulaic exceptions, and in which small samples of the local language are introduced: Ionic in Mimnermus, Doric in Theognis, Attic in Solon.

Sometimes, strange elements are introduced in Solon and Xenophanes, such as -εσσι, formular -οίο, ἀων, κε in Xenophanes, etc.; in Solon, epicisms such as καλλίποιμι, ὅσσον, and ἤλυθε enter, but not κε or -αο.

We can find traces of the local dialects in Semonides (the Ionicisms ὅκου, κοτ', etc.), Theognis (Doricisms such as the G. Εὐρώτα, the inf. φεύγεν and ἧμεν, etc.), Solon, although the manuscript tradition is unreliable. Atticisms such as Ἰαονίας, ὑπερηφανίαν, ἡμέρα, (but ὀβριμοπάτρη, a Homerism) μέσον, and some Ionicisms such as φορεύμενος) were no doubt introduced secondarily. Atticism dominates over Ionicism or Homerism: -σ- against a single ὅσσος, -ου- (against -εο-, perhaps archaic), in addition to a substantial Attic lexicon, cf. Adrados 1953a, p. 138 ff.

Thus, a slightly different Ionic language was formed, with some unobtrusive Homeric remnants, but increasingly fewer, and with minimal contemporary dialectal forms. All of this tended to disappear in elegy and epigram from the fifth century onwards. What remained fixed was this quasi-Ionic which was cultivated and understood everywhere: an updated Homer, but still remote from the local dialect; or an Ionic dialect provided with borrowings and internationalism by epic diction.

This was the route of general diffusion of the Ionic dialect into very common poetic genres. There was another route, more advanced in Ionicisation but less diffused, that of the iambos, which opened the way for Ionic prose (which in turn opened the way for Attic, and Attic for *koine*).

Epigram

160. The language of epigram underwent the reverse process, but in the end there was a convergence. Instead of a Homer approximated to the Ionic dialect, we are dealing with inscriptions in nonliterary dialects which, when written in elegiac distics, were influenced by the language of Homer and elegy. It was a process which led to the assimilation of the epigram's language into that of elegy (and often to the practical confusion of the genres).

In the beginning, epigrams in distics used Homeric formulaic language, translating it into the local dialect; this is best illustrated when an epigraphic version and a version of the manuscrit tradition are available for the same epigram, as in the case of the well-known common burial of the Corinthians in Salamis, Hansen 131 (for example, ποκ' ἐναίομες instead of ποτ' ἐναίομεν). So, Κεφαλλῆνας μεγαθύμους in *Il.* 631 becomes κεφαλλᾶνας μεγαθύμος in Hansen 391; formulaic κούρῃ (Διὸς γλαυκόπιδι κ.) becomes κόρει (Hansen 215); other well-

known formulas see the introduction of Ποτέδάϝονι (Corinth, Hansen 357), κλέϝος, ἄπθιτον (Crisa, Hansen 344), etc.

161. In other cases, Homerisms entered these formulas, which had been imitated from Homer: as in Hansen 145 (Corcyra) ἐπ' Ἀράθθοιο ῥηοϝαῖσι, The fact is, Ionicisms such as ξεῖνος, εἵνεκα. etc. entered the Doric dialects through Homer.

It should be noted that, occasionally, the archaism of the Doric dialects in these inscriptions allows us to rediscover Homeric forms which are older than those present in our manuscripts: as, for instance, in Hansen 367 ηιλέϝο[ι θυ]μῖο, with digamma (or ξένϝος, beside ξεῖνος, as we have seen, also in Doric inscriptions). But an Ionic poet such as Semonides, in his epigram about the seer Megistias (Herodotus VII 228), written in pure Ionic, nevertheless preserved the Homerism κτεῖναν.

Consequently, as we have seen, the influence of elegy was great. In the work by Gentili 1969, p. 69, there is a list of *loci similes* common to epigram and elegy. The language of elegy and that of epigram eventually became unified: although this occurred at a point in which the Ionic of iambos and of prose, freed of Homerisms to a greater extent, had become the most widely used literary language. It would be dethroned by Attic, which it had helped to diffuse.

5. The third general language: the language of choral lyric

General ideas

162. Choral lyric was a religious lyric sung in large public festivals, in contrast to melic lyric, which was sung in festivals of *hetairíai, thíasoi* or groups, or in special circumstances in which a city or an army, etc., asked for the arrival or intervention of the gods.

At the start, the song of the *choregós* or chorus leader was improvised, as we are told by Archilochus 219; the chorus responded to him, above all with refrains, when they were not just marking time or dancing. Later, both the song of the *choregós* and that of the chorus became literary, the work of a poet. This corresponds to the mixed lyric, as attested in Alcman and Stesichorus, I believe. But at some point, the chorus began to sing the whole song, multiplying

groups of strophe/antistrophe/epode: this corresponds to choral lyric, whose main representative is Pindar.

Another variant is provided by dialogic lyric (between two *choregoí* or two choruses) or, within one chorus, in the multiplication of the unit formed by a song by the choregós followed by a song by the chorus. There are traces of all this in popular lyric and also in theatre lyric.

The fact is that improvised lyric, with its variety of possibilities, was just as old as epic, and also oral; there are clear allusions to it in Homer and Hesiod, who occasionally adapted it to their hexameters, in literary lyrics and in other authors. Parallels exist, such as the *Hymns of the Veda*, which attest to its antiquity; and traces have been preserved of old popular lyric, often in various re-elaborations. On the other hand, the rhythms of choral lyric (and of monody or Aeolic melic too) are inherited, and were not invented by the poets who transformed this whole lyric, starting from the eighth century (Eumelus of Corinth), but above all during the seventh century, into the personal poetry written by the 'poets' or creators. I have dealt with the origins of the lyric in detail elsewhere.

163. However, with regard to the language, it must be said that we are in a worse situation now than when we spoke of Homer and epic language in general. With it we were able to establish with some degree of certainty what the epic language of the second millennium must have looked like and to understand how, from this language, the language of eighth century was created; and, furthermore, how the latter evolved into elegy and iambos. Here, we are practically limited to the literary lyric of the seventh century onwards. Very little remains of popular lyric, and the little that has reached us is very influenced by the lyric of the great authors.

Indeed, the attempts that have been made to link the language of choral lyric with Mycenaean have not attracted many followers. An example is the theory of Pavese and others, cited earlier in reference to Hesiod, which proposes the existence of a western poetic language to which non-Homeric phonetic and morphological characteristics of Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns are attributed, as well as some others of choral lyric and the language of the (monodic) Lesbian lyric, and even of oracles, cf. J. A. Fernández Delgado 1986. The Homeric elements of all this poetry are recent.

Although it is evident through the study of phraseology that non-Homeric traditions existed – this can be seen in Hesiod and the *Hymns* but also in the rich formation of words in choral lyric – for phonetics and morphology things are more complicated, but we will return to this later. It is also clear that Homeric influence was essential in choral lyric as a whole and in Lesbian monody.

The most we can venture to say is that, evidently, a Doric popular lyric existed which avoided becoming too similar to the local dialects and also to Ionic. It possibly united certain characteristics that were widely diffused in Doric and N.W. Greek, such as the Ac. pl. in -ος and the D. pl. in -εσσι (some were also Aeolic), with the elimination of Doric characteristics which were too specific and which distanced the city dialects from each other as well as from Homer. Yet Homer must have exerted an influence from an early date, for knowledge of Homer is attested in the few fragments of popular lyric and in metrical inscriptions from the very outset.

164. So, it would seem that we are facing a continuation of the oral lyric of West Greek, which was continued in the continent where it received contributions which were also diffused in the Aeolic dialects of Boeotia and Thessaly (from which they went on to Lesbos) and others descending from Homer. From this point on, new forms were able to enter, among them Aeolicisms. These gave rise to the entry of post-Homeric Lesbianisms, such as -οισα.

The oldest choral lyric should be conceived as a minimal lyric, brief invocations to the gods, extremely brief refrains: there is no reason why it should be combined with Hesiod or the Lesbian poets. It was influenced from the start by Homer, as I noted, but also undoubtedly by Lesbian monody, judging from the Lesbianisms in choral lyric as a whole. I have referred to this in §§ 162 ff. All this is deduced from a comparison of the language of different choral lyric poets, who share a 'generic' Doric, minimal continental elements which are difficult to define, a lack of Ionicisms and Homeric and Lesbian elements.

In contrast, no Ionic or Aeolic choral lyric has been preserved: we can only point this out. It is possible that it may have existed as Archilochus would have sung his dithyrambs in Ionic: his 'Hymn to Hercales and Iolaus' has Ionic and Homeric resonances and its monodic strophes – which unite dactylic, iambic and trochaic rhythms – presupposes the previous existence of chorals, just like those of Sappho

and Alcaeus; in this case, in addition, what we have are the remnants of the epithalamium sung in Lesbian by *choregoí* and choruses, at least, this is my theory. But the only one that has been preserved for us is Doric choral lyric.

165. To gain a better understanding of this, it is important to study the origins of Greek lyric, to which I have dedicated a book, Adrados 1986a. Fragments of popular and ritual Greek hymns can be found in the *Poetae Melici Graeci* by D. Page 1967 and 1974, in J. U. Powell 1970 and in H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons 1983, among others; in translation, with bibliographic information and notes, in Adrados 1980. On the metre, cf. A. Meillet, 1975, p. 145 ff. The dependency of the language of lyric on Mycenaean has been studied, recently, by C. Trümpy 1986, see the critique by C. J. Riujgh 1986 and that by C. Brillante 1987 (who provides bibliographic precedents).

With regard to the theory of the 'western poetical language', refer back to § 163. This theory is supported by, for example, Ch. Verdier 1972 with respect to the non-epic Aeolicisms of Pindar. I believe (see § 169) that, on a base of Homeric Aeolicisms, new Aeolicisms were progressively incorporated into the lyric ones from an Aeolic tradition which evidently existed, but which must not be confused with the continental Doric choral (which, I insist, displays hardly any specific characteristics; there are hardly any Boeotisms, for example), and is not really Doric. Another point is that elements such as αἰ, the inf. in -μεν, D. pl. -εσσι, or πεδά go beyond the limits of Aeolic: these are choices within a wider dominion. Above all, this theory does not take sufficiently into account the role played by the influence of epic language and the progressive character of the incorporation of Lesbianisms and other elements.

For the different Doric dialects, see the works cited in the bibliography. For the language of the choral lyric, see, among others, A. Meillet 1975, p. 208 ff.; O. Hoffman 1973, p. 125 ff.; R. Hiersche 1970, p. 128 ff.; L. R. Palmer 1980, p. 119 ff.; M. Nöthiger 1971. For Pindar, see, specifically, B. Forssmann 1968; Ch. Verdier 1972; P. Hummel 1993 (on syntax in particular). For Simonides, see O. Poltera 1997. On the role of the language of choral lyric in tragedy, F. R. Adrados 1953a and 1975c, also G. Björk 1950; on phraseology, compounds, etc., in the language of theatre choruses, F. R. Earp 1970 and 1972, A. Long 1968; and W. Breitenbach 1934.

166. The fact is that in the eighth century with Eumelus, and then in the seventh century with Alcman, in the seventh/sixth century with Arion, in the sixth century with Stesichorus and Ibycus, in the sixth/fifth with Simonides, Pindar and Bacchylides, we see the full flourishing of choral lyric, continued by tragedy, which is known to us beginning with *The Persians* by Aeschylus, from 472. Then come some minor poets and ritual lyric, anonymous or not, which was sung at various celebrations.

It should be noted that very little by Eumelus has been transmitted to us (a very small fragment, which combines Doric ᾱ, Homeric ἔπλετο and two Lesbianisms in -οισα), that nothing has survived by Arion, and that the textual tradition of the authors who transmit quotations from these poets is often suspicious, and vastly different from that of the papyri which have been handed down to us. The same was noted with regard to the epigrams transmitted through literary quotations and their epigraphic versions. This complicates our task.

Two things should be pointed out. First, that the great festivals where this poetry flourished took place in Dorian countries: Delphi, Corinth, Sparta, Argolis, Sicyon and only secondarily (since Pisistratus), Athens; whereas the poets, with the exception of Eumelus, are not Dorian – unless Alcman is taken to be Dorian; we are told that he came to Sparta from Lydia. Stesichorus and Ibycus came from Himera and Rhegium, respectively, the former city having a mixed language (Ionic and Doric, cf. Thucydides, VI 5), the second, Ionic. Simonides and Bacchylides were Ionic and came from Ceos. Pindar was Boeotian.

So, neither the native dialects of the poets nor those of the cities in which they lived or performed (Stesichorus in Sparta, Ibycus in Samos, Simonides, after having been in Syracuse with Pindar and Bacchylides, in Thessaly, etc.) managed to influence the language of their poems. These were international artists who sang for an international public in an international language with a Doric base, which was accorded prestige and intelligibility by a very strong Homeric component. In substance, it was a 'diminished' Doric with Homeric and, to a lesser extent, Lesbian elements. There are hardly any Laconisms in Alcman, Boeotisms in Pindar, etc.; Ionic hardly entered (except when it came from Homer), with some exceptions in Ibycus and Bacchylides.

In short, we are dealing with an artificial poetic language filled with a polymorphism which offered doublets and even triple forms from which the poets could choose. It is the Doric counterpart of the other literary language, epic, which was succeeded by elegy, also international. Quite simply, it was meant for another type of poetry, other kinds of festivals and ceremonies, wherever it was practiced and whatever the native origin of the poet. Both lines of the poetic language shared a Homeric and, in part, Lesbian component: they differed because of the Ionic accent in the former, and the Doric accent in the latter.

167. In summary, the language of choral lyric contained an enormous amount of polymorphism, which included:

(a) Homeric elements, with Ionic and Aeolic doublets (but not all), including those which can also be interpreted as Doric.
(b) Non-Homeric Doric (or continental) elements.
(c) Non-Homeric Aeolic elements.

Thus, the difference with respect to the epic language is that, on the one hand, it was restricted (as in elegy), on the other hand, it was extended with 'new Doricisms' and 'new Lesbianisms' justified by the existence in Homer of forms which can be interpreted as Doric or Aeolic, to which other non-Homeric forms were added. There must have been an interplay between a Doric or continental language and a Homeric language which displayed common forms and, through these, justified the introduction of new forms, as for example that of new Lesbianisms.

So, this language was not absolutely uniform. In general terms, it should be pointed out that the Doric element tended to become reduced and the Ionic element to expand (forms which were at the same time Homeric, with exceptions, as mentioned above). This evolution may be followed from Alcman to tragedy.

Analysis of the fundamental elements of the language of choral lyric

168. A general revision will be provided, eleborated later with references to the evolution of this language and its peculiarities in each author. I think it is more practical to start with the Doric elements.

1. Non-Homeric Doricisms, understood in the general sense: they appear frequently in the various dialects of West Greek, and even in those of N.W. Greek; some are at the same time Aeolic. The list is all encompassing – some of these 'Doricims' are lacking in some poets – but it is certainly not a complete list.

So, we have the contractions αε > η and αο/ω > α (in the stems in -ᾱ, the G. sg. -ᾱ, pl. -ᾱν); the preservation of -τι in δίδωτι; pl. -ντι; the accent παίδα; the pronouns ἁμές, τύ, τιν, τοί, νιν; the verbal forms ἐντί, ἦς; the adverbs ὅκα, πόκα; forms such as γλέφαρον, ὄρνιχα, ὠρανός.

To reduce the impression of anti-Homerism, it can be said that in Hom. there is τύνη and nouns that preserve -τι; that in the more

archaic script there was no accent and ΑΜΟΣ was so written, the addition of accents and writing ἁμος or ἅμμος came later. The same can be said for οὐ/ὠ-.

It is important to point out that certain characteristic Doricims were avoided (in a general sense): the aor. in -ξα- of dental stems, the fut. in -σέω, the desinence -μες, κα, the pronominal G. as in τέος, ἐμέος. Specific 'western' forms are also absent, such as -ρσ- > -ρρ-, D. pl. -οις, and in all this there are sometimes differences with respect to certain local dialects, including Laconian and Boeotian, which were spoken by Alcman and Pindar.

2. Doricisms (in the same sense) which are found in Homeric doublets: as in aspiration/ø, ϝ/ ø, ᾱ/η (the first being common in our poets), κᾱλός/κᾰλός, αἰ/εἰ, μέσσος/μέσος, τοί/οἱ, D. pl. -σι/ -εσσι, -οισι/-οις, -αισι/-αις, ἔβᾰν, inf. in -μεν/-μεναι/-ναι, μετά/πεδά.

Here, our poets occasionally preferred (but there is variation) forms within the Homeric doublets which were identical to the Doric ones, although this is not the case in Homer: their presence there serves as a support for their use. It is evident that ᾱ goes far beyond its use in Homer (but in the choruses of the tragedy it is restricted in turn) and the use of η is much more limited. It is also clear that ϝ, although it was maintained in the Doric dialects, was rarely preserved in our poets; that Ionic variants such as -ναι tended to be rejected; and that, in contrast, other forms were accepted, such as -εσσι and πεδά, qualified as Aeolic, but really belonging to continental Greek. There is -εσσι where metrically it would not fit in the hexameter. At any rate, the use of certain forms is justified by their presence in Homer.

3. Other Doricims which appear in doublets. I am referring to forms such as Μῶσα/Μοῦσα/Μοῖσα, to the inf. φέρειν/φέρην, φέρεν, and the Ac. pl. -ᾱς/-ᾰς, -ως/-ους/-ος. Once again, it must be observed that the old graphia did not distinguish where we now distinguish and it is difficult to establish what was ancient, later there was a tendency towards 'Doric' forms; and to the post-Homeric Aeolic forms of the type Μοῖσα, including fem. participles in -οισα, 3rd pl. -οισι. It seems clear that the existence of Aeolic forms in Homer, interpretable as such, attracted new Lesbianisms: a process that ran parallel to others we looked at in the Homeric language.

169. Archaic, Aeolic, and Ionic forms (or forms of another type),

have entered by means of Homeric polymorphism. Sometimes, the polymorphism continues and both forms are accepted.

In the case of archaisms we are presented with, for example, the alternation between verbal forms with or without augment or of the G. in -οιο (rare, but present in the lyric); Lesbianisms, κεν alternating with ἄν, ἄμμες/ἡμεῖς, φαεννός/φαεινός, Μοῖσα and others. In the case of Ionicisms (although the term may be rather narrow), we are presented with ὅτε, ξεῖνος/ξένος. Pure Homerisms may substitute a Doric form, as in the case of -οιο or the name of the goddess Ἄρτεμις. But these are rare, just as the non-Homeric Ionicisms, as mentioned earlier.

Two things must be stressed with respect to φαεννός: first, that the graphia with geminate is not old and that the accent may or may not be so; second, that, nevertheless, this phonetic treatment has a wider diffusion in choral lyric than in Homer. In effect, it has eliminated certain Aeolicisms or archaisms (G. in -αο, -άων), but has widened the dominion of Aeolicism, on a base of Aeolicisms from Homer, including those which, as we have seen, were Doric or continental at the time.

170. This much is definite: a general and diminished Doric, justified by Homer or not incompatible with it in general, dominates the whole scene; the choral lyric certainly goes further than Homer in certain details, in others there is variation depending on the poets. Aeolicisms are also justified by Homer – when they are not, it is due to their presence in 'Doric' dialects – and they increase in number; Ionicisms are also justified in this way, but they hardly increase in number. This is the general definition of this language, a Doricising variant of the language of epos.

Yet, compounds, phraseology and syntax must be examined, as well as phonetics and morphology. Here, Homeric influence is considerable, although hexametric formulas do not often exactly fit. But there is a proliferation of new compound words, new phraseology and a daring syntax, full of interruptions and stylistic uses, with little subordination: cf. for example, M. Nöthiger 1971, p. 162 ff. and P. Hummel 1993. All this differs markedly from the Homeric language, as Hesiod also differed in part. It is believed that there are also traces here of an independent tradition, that of the oral type of choral lyric from continental Greece, most fully developed by our poets, culminating with Pindar.

It must be pointed out that, from what we can see, this language is more or less the same as popular choral lyric and ritual lyric. The former is known to us through quotations from later authors who have sometimes disfigured it; nevertheless, Doric ᾱ and other characteristics may be found in the song of the Elean women (*PMG* 871), in the old men's hymn to Aphrodite (*PMG* 872), in the hymn of the Chalcidians in honour of Cleomachus (*PMG* 873: together with λάχετ' without augment and a Hesiodic epithet of Eros, λυσιμελής), in the Locrian song of adultery in *PMG* 853 (there is both ᾱ and ἄμμ'), etc. Some of these passages are monodic.

However, there is obviously less regularisation: the Rhodian song of the swallow (*PMG* 848) repeatedly makes use of the 1st pl. in -μες.

Similarly, we find ritual lyric in engraved inscriptions in temples, to be sung by the faithful, in Delphi, Dion, Palaikastro, etc., from the fifth to the second century. These are 'editions', as it were, of the same texts, often accompanied by musical notation (in the treasury of the Athenians in Delphi). They take ᾱ, -οισι/ -οις/ -εσσι, -ους/ -ος, Ποσειδάν, παιάν/παιών, forms lacking augment such as γείνατο, etc., and always 1st pl. in -μεν and Homerisms such as ὦρσε, πόληος.

The evolution and variants of choral lyric language

171. The evolution of this language is recorded from Alcman to Bacchylides. It consisted in more Homerism, more Ionicism (but in Homeric terms, barring exceptions) and less Doricism (but while certain Doricisms from Alcman decrease in number, others increase with Homeric support); while Lesbian elements, in general, also increase. This is particularly well illustrated in M. Nöthiger's statistics, but also in the rest of the bibliography cited.

This evolution is often reflected in the doublets according to the statistics provided by M. Nöthiger: for example, the preference for εἰ after Stesichorus and Ibycus, for πρός increasingly, until Pindar, the progressive increase of the proportion in favour of -οις, the progressive tendency towards ὅτε; from Simonides onwards, there is almost only μετά, etc. Forms from Ionic and even Attic (including Boeotian) increase in number, but only when they are supported by Homer. From Alcman onwards, there is a reduction in Doricisms.

Ionic-Homeric variants increase in number from Simonides onwards, so that even -ναι enters; little of Doric is left in Simonides and Bacchylides (-α, -αν, νιν, τιν, rare -ξα-, and not much else), -εν and

-σι disappearing; and Pindar also inclines towards εἰ, πρός, -ους, κᾰλός. However, earlier in Stesichorus, Doricisms from Alcman such as ϝ-, -τι and the Doric pronouns are absent (but some epic forms are present: -οιο, ὄχεσφιν, a hybrid ὠρανόθεν). So, there was an increase in pure Homerisms, which were hardly present in Alcman. At the end of the evolution, a few non-Homeric Ionicisms entered: G. -έων in Ibycus, οἰκεῦσι, ἵλεως, βορήϊος in Bacchylides. Some more Lesbisms also entered of the type ἐπαίνημι and of those with -οις- and -νν-.

The recent book by O. Poltera 1997 allows the study of the differences (which in any case are slight) between the choral poets. Simonides is closer to Pindar in language and phraseology, both being more 'Doric' and Homeric than Bacchylides. Simonides is more advanced than the latter, for example, in his use of κε and the G. sg. in -ου. Exceptionally, he introduces Ionic η ('Αθηναίωι). Yet, the differences between the papyri and manuscript tradition as well as textual problems often make it difficult to reach any exact conclusions.

172. The process of leaving a minimum of Doricisms and increasing Homerisms and even Ionicisms has advanced the most in the choruses of tragedy, studied by Björk 1950. Ᾱ is limited to a few traditional roots and suffixes; η is also present and there are hybrid forms (φήμα). Other Doric forms include G. in -ᾱ, -ᾱν and -ξα, τοί. Besides these, there are also Homeric forms (εἰν, ἐμέθεν, ἔβαν, -μεσθα, ἤλυθον, ἀρείων, verbals forms without augment), Homeric-Aeolic forms (ἄμμι, ἔμμεν) and Homeric-Ionic forms (ξεῖνος, δούρατος). In this way, we have a useful polymorphism (νᾱός/νεώς, ξένος/ξεῖνος, ἄμμι/ἁμῖν, -οιο/ου, etc.). Homeric vocabulary and phraseology is added.

Atticisms also entered, as they had earlier in Solon, and these are studied in my articles Adrados 1953a and 1957: -αισι, ἤν, δύνῃ, ὄπωπα, γῆρυς, phonetics that are archaic Attic and Homeric at the same time (-ρσ-, -σσ-), and an abundant archaic vocabulary. This tends to distinguish the sacred language of Attic choral song (which was more or less common, but also elevated), from the trimeters. Yet, there is a clear evolution in phonetics and morphology in an approximation to the common language. Nevertheless, the phraseology and new lexicon in poets such as Pindar and Aeschylus create an environment that is very distant from that of prose.

173. Mention must also be made of ritual lyric, to which I have alluded earlier and for which we have epigraphic evidence from the fourth century BC onwards (and from the fifth century in later copies). It is important to note that a similar language was used throughout the Greek world: the 'diminished' Doric, previously discussed, in addition to some Homerisms.

The same occurs when it comes to engraved poems in Delphi, in Epidaurus, Palaikastros (Crete) or in Athens. Here, for example, the hymn of Macedon to Apollo and Asclepius in an inscription in the temple of Asclepius, contains, along with Doric forms such as εὐφαρέτρα[ν, Homeric forms such as γείνατο, ὄνειαρ, μερόπεσσι, αἰέν; and doublets such as κοῦροι/κόροι. Doricisms such as βέβακες, τεόν, κατῆχε, ποντοφόρος (Ac. pl.), but -μεν, κοῦρε, are present in the hymn to Diktaian Zeus of Palaikastro. In the hymn of Philodamus of Scarphea to Dionysus, in Delphi, the same mixture appears, in addition to a vocabulary with Homerising compounds such as ἁλιοφεγγής.

174. There was a gap through which the common language of the poet and his audience could enter, as in the case of Hesiod, Tyrtaeus and Theognis, among others. This also occurred in older choral lyric, but only to a small degree, for the common and international language which we have been discussing was always dominant.

So, we do not come across any of the typical Laconian forms which we might expect, such as aspirated -σ-, yet we do come across σιός. Also Boeotian phonetics, which have a large presence in Corinna, are absent in Pindar, for example, des. -ονθι, βανά, πέτταρες: in this and so many other things, such as the lack of attention to digamma, Pindar follows Homer instead of the local dialect. Few forms are attributed to the latter, and even these are uncertain, for example τά 'such as', περ, καν, νόμον, δίδοι. The native Ionic poets only rarely introduced this dialect in places where it differed from Homer.

Thus, we have seen that there is a gradual distancing from purer Doric and an approximation to Ionic (and to some extent, Lesbian) where it coincides with Homer. This means that the two poetic languages of Greece – the Ionicising language of Homer, elegy and iambos (with gradual differences), and the Doricising language of choral lyric – apart from sharing common elements, tended to converge. The more abrupt epicisms, Doricisms and Lesbianisms disappeared, and the common nucleus grew increasingly larger.

On this base, one of the subdialects, the Ionic of iambos (which we have not yet discussed and which, to a large extent, dominated both) would gradually become the common language of prose, followed by one of its variants, already known to us, which had penetrated into Solon and the theatre: the somewhat Ionicised Attic.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE SPECIFIC LITERARY LANGUAGES: LESBIAN, BOEOTIAN AND SYRACUSAN

1. General overview

175. We have seen how the majority of the Greek dialects are not literary in form, and how general literary languages emerged: the epic language in its various states and languages with either an Ionic or Doric base, but very influenced by Homer and very evolved.

Three literary dialects developed alongside these, and they originated in particular territories, although the literary works were often composed in different parts of Greece. The most important was Lesbian, that is, the Aeolic dialect that was transplanted to the island of Lesbos from Thessaly and the language used in the monodic lyric of Alcaeus and Sappho.

It only survived in this area, aside from later imitations by Theocritus and Balbila. Next to it was the Boeotian dialect, used by the poetess Corinna; and the Syracusan dialect used by Epicharmus and Sophron, Theocritus and in the prose of Archimedes and by some Pythagoreans and Sophists. These dialects were created to satisfy local needs, although their influence spread to the rest of Greece.

These literary dialects, although they inherited much from Homer (and the two latter dialects, also from Lesbian), are on a very different level to the 'general' literary dialects previously discussed. Their geographic and popular 'base' is clear; all that was done was to elevate it to a literary level with the help of foreign influences. Therefore, they can be qualified as 'artificial' or international dialects only to a very small degree. Whatever the secondary diffusion of this literature, it is clear that it was intended for very concrete, monolingual populations.

These 'specific' literary languages are mere episodes within the evolution of the Greek language, whose central line passes, as discussed earlier, through the 'general' literary languages.

Of course, we must distinguish them from the use of certain dialects in literature for documentary or parodic purposes: as, for example,

in Aristophanes (Megarian and Theban in *Acharnians* and Laconian in *Lysistrata*); and from their renewed use from the Hellenistic period onwards, when the geographic dialects had, or were about to, become extinct.

2. The Lesbian language of monodic poetry

176. Although the Lesbian literary language is known to us only through Alcaeus and Sappho around the year 600 BC, it originated in the local Lesbian dialect which is clearly much older; even monody is older.

The Lesbian language must have arrived from Thessaly after the fall of the Mycenaean kingdoms. It supposes the existence of an oral poetic tradition within East Greek: actually, monody broke away from the *chorégos*/chorus complex, extending the monodic intervention of the former. Its metre, the so-called Aeolic metre, has been compared by Meillet to the metre of the *Veda*. Indeed, we have seen how the Homeric language and the language of the choral lyric soon came under the influence of the Aeolian dialect.

Furthermore, Terpander, at the beginning of the seventh century, diffused Lesbian monody in Sparta and Delphi (not to mention the epic poet Lesches of Pyrrha or Mytilene). He played an essential role: the invention of the *bárbitos*, a kind of lyre in seven chords, has been attributed to him, as well as the creation of the structure of the *nómos*, the lyric monody, and the adaptation of hexametric compositions to music.

In the time of Archilochus, the Lesbian 'paean' was already famous (cf. Archilochus 218), and Sappho 106 refers to the Lesbian singer who travelled in strange lands.

Therefore, Lesbian poetry was based on a tradition of oral poetry of the East Greek, but it soon achieved its independence and exerted the aforementioned influences. It did not identify this tradition with the Dorian or Western tradition, although it is clear that Boeotia and Thessaly became linguistically and poetically closely related to the West, and that the Lesbian language of poetry would subsequently influence all literary languages. It would influence choral lyric later than Homer: an increasingly greater number of Lesbian (and even post-Homeric) forms entered it from Alcman on.

It is believed that monody was able to develop in Doric and Ionic territtory in a parallel manner, but few traces remain, except in Anacreon and in other places, which will be discussed later (§ 190). Thus, the poetic genres were divided between dialects, with few exceptions: there was Ionic iambos, Doricising choral lyric and Lesbian monody. The first two genres were diffused throughout Greece while the latter was limited to Lesbos, although its influence extended beyond the island. Each genre is linked to one of the three aforementioned literary languages, themselves being closely related to each other through the influence of Homer.

177. For the Lesbian dialect in general and that of the inscriptions in particular, see W. Blümel 1986 and R. Hodot 1990; for the Lesbian dialect of the poets, see C. A. Mastrelli 1954 and E. M. Hamm 1957. For the history of the interpretations of the Lesbian dialect of the poets, cf. J. J. Hooker 1977 and A. M. Bowie 1981, but in particular, H. Rodríguez Somolinos 1998a. See the relevant pages of the repeatedly cited manuals on the history of the Greek language: A. Meilet 1970, p. 206 ff., O. Hoffman 1973, p. 84 ff., R. Hiersche 1970, p. 118 ff. and L. R. Palmer 1980, p. 113 ff. For Terpander, cf. A. Gostoli 1990. The points of discussion are: the alleged Aeolic or Aeolic-continental lyric; the alleged Homeric origin of certain forms; and the existence of two types of poems in Sappho (as proposed by Lobel), one being more Homerising than the other.

178. The language of Lesbian poetry was not quite the equivalent to the popular Lesbian which is known to us, to some extent, from the inscriptions. Notable examples of Homerisms should be added with respect to phonetics, morphology and vocabulary. However, this study will not examine the issue of whether, in certain narrative poems such as the Marriage of Hector and Andromache by Sappho (44 v.), Homerisms appear in greater number or the issue of how they were assimilated. Additionally, there are other forms and words that create some problems.

It is not a question of listing all the characteristics of Lesbian that are known to us from our study of the dialects and of Homer: the (partial) preservation of ϝ, the treatment of the labiovelars and vocalic sonants, the treatment of the groups -εε-, -σ- + nasal and -ρσ-, the peculiarities of the pronouns and of certain verbal and lexical forms. Post-Homeric Lesbianisms should also be added, for instance, internal -σδ-, -αῦος, the feminine participles in -οισα and the Ac. pl. -οις, -αις, Ζόννσσος, ὄππατα. Furthermore, some which are rare in Homer but common here, such as *baritonesis*, verbs in -ημι instead of contracted forms, the D. pl. -εσσι or the perf. part. in -οντ-.

It should be noted that some of these forms go beyond the limits of Lesbian, as we have seen, and that some 'Homerisms' may be Lesbian archaisms (ᾱ, G. -οιο, -ᾱων, perhaps D. pl. -οις, -αις and verbal forms without augment; and, of course, a normal Lesbian form such as -σσ- which only continued the Homeric phase. This 'coincidence', once again, enabled the fusion of the two dialects with the acceptance of non-Homeric Lesbianisms.

Certainly, other forms used by the Lesbian poets are clearly Homeric: for instance, metric enlargements such as ἀθάνατος, the occasional long ε or ο before -ν/ρ-ϝ (faced with the normal δέρᾱ, γόνα), the G. Πήλεος, the Ionic forms πόληος, ἔδωκαν, etc. Indeed, it was only through Homer that 'Ionic' forms were able to penetrate.

179. However, Homeric influence is most noticeable in the lexicon and phraseology, and the same applies to Hesiod's influence and even that of the *Homeric Hymns* (φαίνολις, εὔστρωτος). In spite of this, as the study by Rodríguez Somolinos demonstrates, a third of the total number of words in the Lesbian poets appear for the first time. Some of these words (which number around five hundred, of which 100 *hapax*) may be archaisms which were preserved here.

To be sure, it is easy to find traces of the Aeolic tradition we have been discussing when certain phrases keep appearing: ἄχω θεσπεσία, χρυσοστέφανος (of Aphrodite). It should be noted that sometimes the Lesbian poets consciously depart from Homer: αἴνναος, ἄχω, ὄχθος instead of ἀένναος, ἠχή, ὄχθα.

All the same, other words come from the popular and colloquial language or from the 'technical' language relating to trades and everyday life.

So, the agreements between Lesbian and Homer enabled the former to be used for literary purposes, with the preservation of only a few Homerisms and the elimination of others. In this way, a local dialect was elevated to the status of a literary language.

3. Corinna's Boeotian

180. Perhaps it was this model that was adopted by Corinna, the Boeotian poetess of the fifth century or perhaps earlier, in order to transform the popular feminine poetry of certain rituals into a personal and literary written poetry in the dialect of her homeland (another poetess, Myrtis, is only known to us by name). After all,

the case of Sappho is no different; other poetesses, such as Praxilla of Sicyon, do not appear to have attempted such an undertaking (but we do not have sufficient data on this).

However, Telesilla of Argos wrote monodic poems in the Doricising language of choral lyric: τὰν ματέρα, ὠρανῶ, but Homeric κατ' οὔρεα, Lesb. φεύγοισα. Similarly so with Timocreon of Rhodes; and we come across the same language in small monodic fragments such as the song of the Elean women and others mentioned above (§ 170). Monodic lyric followed different paths in each location (it serves to recall the Ionic of Anacreon and we will look at the Attic of the Attic scholia, which display some Doric features).

181. On popular feminine poetry, see E. Gangutia 1994 and my books, Adrados 1986a and 1995a. Unfortunately, as with the rest of popular poetry (collected, with introductory studies, in Adrados 1980), the pitiful state in which it has been handed down to us prevents us form forming any conclusions about the language.

182. Corinna's principal fragment, about the dispute between Mount Helicon and Mount Cithaeron, has been transmited to us in a papyrus with Boeotian orthography from around 200 BC, and not in the orthography that she must have used around 500 BC. All the same, the language used was the Boeotian dialect, which had greatly altered phonetics and many notable characteristics which distance it from Doric and Aeolic, with which it nevertheless shared many features, as we know. It contained βανά 'woman' for γυνή, ποκα for ποτε, θιῶν for θεῶν, πράτοι for πρώτῳ, -ττ- for -σσ-, -νθι, -νθη for -ντι, -νται, νιν, φέρεμεν, etc. Corinna goes beyond the limits of choral lyric by using the G. with the -ς of the pronouns (τεοῦς).

It is true that Corinna's dialect is not less interspersed with Homerisms than the rest: τόσον, ἀθανάτων, D. pl. in -οισι, -αισι, forms without augment, ephelcystic -ν, epic words of the type ἀγκουλομείταο; as well as new words based on the Homeric model, such as λιγουροκώτιλος. Once again, it is the existence of ambiguous Homeric-Boeotian forms that justifies the use of this dialect. Yet it remained isolated and did not influence the future of the Greek language.

4. The Doric of Syracuse

183. Syracuse was the only city in western Greece that managed to use its language for literary purposes. Elsewhere in the West, written

literature used the same literary languages with which we are already familiar. We have mentioned the poets Stesichorus and Ibycus. Pindar, Simonides, Bacchylides and Aeschylus would come to the court of Hieron in Syracuse.

However, Syracuse was a great city which experimented with its own language in mime and comedy, created here by Sophron and Epicharmus, respectively, encouraged by the establishment of democracy after the death of Hieron in 478. Only fragments remain, but enough to give us some idea of what this language was like: essentially, a stricter Doric than that of choral lyric, but not strictly the Corinthian one might expect, given the foundation of the city. We are certainly dealing with a popular kind of Doric *koine* which used the popular iambic and trochaic rhythms in parallel with Ionic and Attic. It was, in effect, a local phenomenon which influenced new Attic comedy, yet it was not, in the long run, its rival or a rival of Attic language in general.

The fragments of Epicharmus and Sophron can be found in A. Olivieri 1930. On their language, see A. Meillet 1975, p. 223 ff. and R. Hiersche 1970, p. 159 ff. For the language of the Sicilian inscriptions, see V. Sicca 1924.

184. The well-known Doric phenomena are not worth repeating here. But it is useful to stress the presence of Doricisms which are absent or practically absent in choral lyric, such as the des. of the 1st pl. -μες or personal pronoun forms such as ἐμέος, ἁμές, ὑμές, ψιν, words such as λῆν 'to wish'. Less common forms include ἴσαμι 'I know', the inf. in -μειν (apparently from Rhodian), κάρρων, ἦνθες, πέποσχε, etc. All of this points to a mixed and evolved Doric dialect.

As always, it must be pointed out that some Doricisms such as ᾱ or -σσ- or -εσσι are shared by Homer, and that, in this way, other Homerisms entered, not the more characteristic ones but rather those that were at the same time Ionicisms, such as -εο- (not -ιο- as in Doric), -σ- next to -σσ-, οἱ next to τοί, ephelcystic -ν, γούνασι (but κόρος). Ionicisms or Atticisms such as παρῆσαν, ἐμοῦ, (if we can rely on tradition) entered through this route.

Of course, the Homeric lexicon and phraseology was accepted, as well as words imitated from Homer, often comic or parodic: τοξοχίτωνες, δραστοχαῖτα (applied to Poseidon). There is a prolific, popular creation of compound words such as ἐλαιοφιλοφάγος 'who

likes to eat olives', μακροκαμπυλαύχην 'with a long twisted neck', γυναικάνδρεεσι 'women-men', etc.

Until the third century, there continued to be representations of the *phlyakes*, a type of mime that is found on characteristic vases. Lexicographers preserve some words with Doric forms, such as ἔχωσα, καινᾶν, φαινόλᾶν (formerly, in the *Homeric Hymns* and in Sappho), beside κοθαρός (in inscriptions) and the vulgarism ὀλίοισιν: in all cases, the same phenomenon.

185. But it was not just the comedians (in the general sense) who made the dialect of Syracuse literary. Theocritus, the creator of bucolic poetry in the third century BC, wrote idylls not only in epic and Lesbian dialects, but also in the Doric of Syracuse. This was dependent on the influence of the popular origins of the genre, as in the adoption of the song of the Sicilian shepherds, or on the influence of Hellenistic realism, as in the presentation of Syracusan *hetairai* trying to win back the lover who abandoned her ('The Witches'), or of the two women of Syracuse who attend Adonis's festival in Alexandria ('The Syracusan Women'). All of this was imitated by Bion and Moschus.

Of course, realism was not absolute, Theocritus is tinged with epic and Lesbian poetry. In the first of his idylls, '*Thyrsis*', we find, among other forms:

(a) Doricisms such as ᾱ, εε > η, τᾶν, κώρα, ὅσσον; κα, ἀν-, ποτί, ποκα; τυ, τῆνα, τοί; Πίνδω, ταύρως, παρθένος (Ac. pl.); ἐσσι, 2nd sg. -ες, 1st pl. -μες, inf. -εν, fut. δωσῶ, ληψῆ.
(b) Homerisms such as ποταμοῖο, αἰ, ἄμμι, ὤρεος (Doricised), Λυκαονίδαο, ἄλσεα, λίπε, ἔγεντο.
(c) Non-Homeric Lesbianisms: μελίσδεται, Μοῖσαι, γέλαισα.
(d) Ionicisms: φέρευ.

Once again, we are faced with a local dialect that is influenced by the great literary currents which spread throughout Greece: the Homeric, Lesbian and Ionic currents. However, it was a discovery which had minimal impact outside of Syracuse.

186. Finally, we should take note of the attempt by Archimedes, who was living in Syracuse at the same time as Theocritus, to create a scientific prose in Syracusan Doric. Although he also wrote in *koine* (in the text found in a Jerusalem palimpsest), the works that have been handed down to us through manuscripts are in Syracusan

Doric – though very altered, it must be said, whether due to the influence of *koine* or through medieval transmission. Some Pythagoreans and Sophists also wrote in Doric, as previously mentioned (the *dialexeis*).

This romantic attempt was doomed to fail. Attic *koine*, which had begun to penetrate early on and would become universal in the fourth century, was strictly and persistently imposed in Syracuse, as it had been in Lesbos, Cyprus, Laconia and the entire Greek world. Soon, Sicily would become Roman.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE LITERARY LANGUAGES OF THE ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL PERIODS: IONIC AND ATTIC

1. Ionic in the iambographers and in general poetry

187. After the language of epic and elegy, the third general language of the Greeks, a literary language with a dialectal base, is the Ionic of the iambos. It is not an updated and Ionicised epic language, but an Ionic language with epic ingredients, although this is not always easy to see. In contrast to the language of elegy, this language is only recorded in Ionia, although Stesichorus no doubt also used it in his *iamboi.* But Ionia also refers to Attica, for the literary Attic of Solon and of drama is a variant of Ionic, and it is the predecessor of an Ionic language which had a greater diffusion: that of Ionic prose, which, as discussed earlier, in turn opened the way for Attic prose.

The term *iambos,* certainly not a Greek word, is used to refer to a series of genres in either iambic rhythm (a foot containing two syllables, short and long) or trochaic rhythm (the reverse). The iambic trimeter had a great diffusion, as well as the choliambic (the same, but with a long penultimate syllable), the catalectic trochaic tetrameter, epodes or distics which combine iambic or trochaic *kola* or 'members' with dactylic or other *kola.*

This popular poetry was cultivated by Archilochus of Paros (seventh century), Semonides of Amorgos, Hipponax of Ephesus and Solon of Athens (sixth century), and subsequently by Attic comedy (from Susarion in the sixth century onwards, allegedly). It flourished in certain popular cults, like those of Dionysus and Demeter, in the context of jokes and free conversational language. Although the themes are partly similar to those of elegy, there is more freedom here in the treatment of the same themes and in the language. For the first time, we encounter a language of the people in a register that is a cross between the colloquial and satirical, and is sometimes even vulgar.

188. This, in general terms, constituted the Ionic dialect, only it received a literary character with the help of epicisms which were not so remote from conversational language.

I will not deal with the Ionic of Stesichorus's iamboi, which is difficult to reconstruct because the material we have is Atticised (cf. Adrados 1982a). Archilochus, to begin with, used contracted froms (particularly -ευ- for -εο-), crasis, so-called Attic declension (πλέως), forms of the type ὀκοίην, D. (predominantly) in -οῖσι, thematic ὀλλύω, etc. There is no G. in -ᾱο, -ᾱων, apocope of the type κάλλιπον, infinitives in -μεν, -μέναι, case in -φι, Aeolic forms with -μμ- nor κε (with one exception), etc.; only in parodic or cultural contexts do we find Διωνύσοι', Ἰόλαος, λίπε. There are Homeric forms, but these are assumed to be archaic Ionic before contraction, such as ἄεθλον, or before metathesis (παρήορος).

It is interesting to see the innovations of the lexicon: old words with a new meaning, popular vocabulary, sometimes obscene (σάθη, μύκης, 'prick') or from the countryside (λιπερνῆτες, 'poor') or burlesque (κεροπλάστης 'with a hairstyle in the form of a horn', βάβαξ 'charlatan'), occasionally of non-Greek origin (μύρτον 'mirth', μύρον 'unguent'). And yet, Archilochus's iamboi, as demonstrated by D. Page 1963, are full of Homeric formulas and echoes, sometimes with a change in meaning.

Similar observations can be made with respect to Semonides. For instance, there is no -εσσι, -οιο, we find ὅκως and related forms, forms without contraction (sometimes with synizesis), etc. But there are sporadic Homerisms such as ἔειπεν, γηρᾱσέμεν, μιν, οὔρεσιν. A new vocabulary appears, sometimes popular (σαῦλα βαίνων, 'walking effeminately', ἀσβόλη 'ash', βακκάρι 'Lydian unguent', λιταργός 'who runs quickly', etc.).

Hipponax is clearly Ionic (Ἀττάλεω, κρέσσον, ὅκου); the Homerisms are parodic (ἄμμορος). There is an abundance of popular words (πυγεών 'ass', κατωμόχανος 'homosexual') or borrowings from Lydian or Phrygian (πάλμυς 'chief', καύης 'priest', βέκος 'bread'). Here, instead of a lexicon of the Greek substratum we have a substratum from other languages. But, instead of the colloquial Ionic of the other iambographers, here we find above all a truly vulgar Ionic, full of foreign words and obscene terms.

189. Solon presents an even more interesting case, because in his words we see how, with slight modifications, the language of the

iambos has become Attic, something which would develop into two different varieties: comedy and tragedy. Here, we find pure -ᾱ and the contraction -εο- > -ου-; but there is also Ionic η through Homeric reminisence (ἀναγκαίης) and a contraction -ευ- (1, 45), probably cited from an Ionic iambographer; there are also the Ionic forms μοῦνον, ἔερδον, no doubt from Homer, as well as archaic Attic vocabulary, as one would expect (cf. Adrados 1953a).

The fact is that within the Ionic territory, including Attica, the popular language became literary for the very first time, albeit with certain epic touches (hardly ever archaic or Aeolic). In Ionia itself this type of poetry was soon exhausted, but it continued in Attica in comedy; and, with less popularity, in tragedy. This limited route, together with that of Ionic prose, which soon spilled over Ionian borders, contributed to the creation of literary Attic, otherwise favoured for historical reasons linked with the commercial and political expansion of Athens.

I would like to draw attention to the enormous impact of the creation, for the very first time, of a literary Attic in Solon's work, as a variant of the Ionic of the iambos. It was an innovation of enormous transcendence, as its political creation had been, democracy. For, when tragedy was created – an Attic invention in which the chorals of lyric or 'Doric' language were accompanied by iambic dialogue – there was a model to write these *iamboi* in Attic: Solon. Subsequently, the model of tragedy and also of satyrical drama made an Attic iambos possible in comedy when it was created in 485. This was one of the precedents for Athenian prose at the end of the fifth century.

There is another precedent: the Attic skolia. The collection which is preserved dates back to between the end of the sixth century and an indeterminable date in the fifth century. However much they depend on the language of choral lyric, containing Doric and Homeric forms (especially ᾱ, ἔμμεν, κ', ἔγεντ', ἄνασσα, etc.), they also contain forms which are either Ionic-Attic or simply Attic: contracted forms (οἰνοχοεῖν, κατεσθίειν, ἐλθεῖν, ἐπιλήθου, πλουτεῖν, φρονεῖν) alternating with uncontracted forms, D. pl. -οῖς/-οῖσι, -μεσθα, and, above all, the dual (κτανέτην, χαίρετον, etc.).

To be sure, models of Attic or semi-Attic prose were created in a rather surreptitious manner.

190. It is still worth recalling that melic poetry was also composed in literary Ionic: concretely, in Anacreon of Teos, who fought in Abdera, Thrace, lived in the courts of Polycrates of Samos and Hipparchus of Athens, and died in Thessaly. His poetry travelled to all these places.

Anacreon's poetry was written in a purely Ionic language with uncontracted forms (ἐπιστρέφεαι, ὁμιλέων, but also the Ionic contraction Δεύνυσε), η (πορφυρῇ), D. pl. in -ῃσι, crasis (κἀκατόν), and variants such as πολιήτης. It accepted much satirical and popular vocabulary, as in the poem against Artemon (PMG 43). But, of course, it also contained some rare Homerisms: πτερύγεσσι, ὀχάνοιο, δακρυόεσσαν, also in the lexicon, with poetic or Homeric compounds created on the latter. There are also rare Lesbianisms such as κόϊλος, χρυσοφαέννων. In short, we are faced with an Ionic that is slightly coloured with archaisms or Homeric and Lesbian forms, as in the lyrical tradition in which Anacreon is included.

2. Ionic prose

Generalities and beginnings

191. Prose for literary purposes began to be written in Greece from the mid-sixth century BC onwards (this should be distinguished from the diverse types of prose mentioned above used in inscriptions). The writings were either philosophical (including cosmogonic) or historical. They have been preserved in a very incomplete form, in small fragments, with the exception of the last flowering of this prose, which has been transmitted to us through the medieval manuscripts of Herodotus and the *Corpus Hippocraticum*. The transmission is defficient and there are serious doubts about the origin of the Attic forms found in it.

Evidently, the origins of the prose can be traced back to a change of mentality. The documentary prose of inscriptions was set aside, as the new individualistic and rationalistic culture sought to create an entirely different way of thinking and a history that consciously departed from the ancient myths. Occasionally, poetry also aspired to this (in Xenophanes or Parmenides). This was accompanied by an approximation to the everyday colloquial language and a rejection, at least in part, of the old models (although those models

continued to exert an influence, in their distance from the everyday and the trivial).

192. It should be added that this Ionic prose was universal, being the only existing Greek prose at the time, and was adopted by writers of Doric origin or by others, whatever their origin, who lived and worked in non-Ionic speaking cities.

That is, there were Ionic writers: among others, the logographers who wrote in the Asian cities and in the islands (Hecataeus of Miletus is the most well-known), Pherecydes of Syros (the author of a cosmogony), the Milesian philosophers, Heraclitus of Ephesus, Democritus and Protagoras of Abdera.

But there were also writers who were born outside this linguistic region: as is the case, as is well known, of Herodotus, who was born in the Dorian city of Halicarnassus (he later moved to the Ionian island of Samos, then to Athens and other parts), and in the case of Hippocrates and the physicians of the Dorian island of Cos, some of whom were travelling physicians. But there is also the case of, for example, Acusilaus of Argos (author of a genealogy), Hellanicus of Mytilene (author of a history of Attica) and Pherecydes of Athens (author, too, of a genealogy), among the logographers. On the other hand, many writers who were Ionian or wrote in Ionic lived in Athens: Democritus, Hellanicus, Anaxagoras of Clazomenae, Protagoras and other philosophers and Sophists.

How did all this occur? The movement in favour of Greek prose evidently originated in Ionia, where philosophers and historians decided to dispense with those poetic dialects which were also Ionicising. The shift from a mythical to a rational mentality is reflected in the shift from hexametric poetry (iambic poetry was also inadequate) to prose. But there was an essential precedent: apart from the official Ionic of the inscriptions, there was also a popular Ionic of the iambos. Another leap, and the move to prose was made.

These thinkers travelled throughout Greece and had an influence everywhere, particularly in Athens. But at a certain point, in the last third of the fifth century, it was certainly in Athens where they realised that if they were to widen their influence in a city which had become, intellectually-speaking, the main city of Greece, they would have to write in Attic.

Evidently, the Sophists and philosophers in Athens spoke in Attic. It was a diglossia, for they spoke in Attic and wrote in Ionic. But

at least one of them, Gorgias, who had arrived from Leontini, Sicily, in 427, broke with this habit and started to write in Attic. He did this precisely at a moment in which Attic was invading Ionic. He had the courage to break away, thereby opening the way for the Athenians and later for others. Indeed, the triumph of Attic in a world where it coexisted with Ionic marked the start of the creation of *koine*: Attic with certain Ionic or general variants of Greek.

193. The shift from hexametric poetry to prose (still avoided by philosophers such as Xenophanes, Empedocles and Parmenides) was not easy psychologically speaking: literature was strictly poetic. It was helpful, just as for the formation of the different poetic languages, that precisely these languages were full of Ionicisms: they were a mixture of Ionicisms and epicisms of various origins, sometimes also of Lesbianisms. Ionic prose continued this process to a certain extent, insofar as it continued to add epic elements to the Ionic elements, albeit in a more restricted way.

The relation between spoken Ionic and Ionic prose presents a real problem. To begin with, the former is hardly known to us. We know only the language of the inscriptions, which does not support the assertion by Herodotus I 42 that there were four dialects in Ionia: very small differences are found, particularly certain innovations in Chios and Erythrae, and other coincidences in Chios and Miletus. By contrast, in Herodotus, who is the most studied author, important sections of vocabulary are found which are lacking in the inscriptions. Indeed, in all these authors we find Homerisms, to a greater or lesser degree, as well as the development of a new paratactic syntax and stylistic features destined for success: alliterations and repetitions, a new word order, the historic present rejected by Homer, etc.

194. On the Ionic dialect of the inscriptions, see Ch. Favre 1914, A. López Eire 1984b, p. 340 ff. and K. Stüber 1996. On the language of Ionic prose in general, cf. above all E. Norden 1898, K. Deichgräber 1962, H. Haberle 1938 and S. Lilja 1968. On Herodotus, G. Steinger 1957, M. Untersteiner 1949, H. B. Rosén 1962, E. Lamberts 1967, I. Beck 1971 and D. G. Müller 1980. On the whole subject in general, R. Hiersche 1970, p. 198 ff., O. Hoffmann 1973, p. 168 ff., L. R. Palmer 1980, p. 142 ff.

The remarks of the ancient critics are not very coherent. The statement by Strabo I, 2, 6 that the most ancient prose only differs from poetry in its lack of metre is contradicted by Cicero, *De orat.* II 12, 53, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *De Thuc.* 23, who refer to its lack of ornament; Hermogenes,

De id. II 399 contrasts Hecataeus (who is 'pure and clear', and 'uses pure Ionic') and Herodotus, whom he calls 'mixed' and 'poetic'.

For the language and style of the older works of the *Corpus Hippocraticum*, cf. among others, P. Fabrini–A. Lanni 1979, A. López Eire 1984b and 1992, O. Wenskuns 1982 and A. López Férez 1987. As regards the creation of a scientific vocabulary and the actual structure of the treatise, I provide references in the chapter on the creation of the scientific language.

195. We find ourselves before a series of writers, the first of whom were active in the second half of the sixth century (Anaximander, Pherecydes of Syros, Acusilaus of Argos); at the turn of the sixth and fifth centuries (Hecataeus, Alcmaeon, Heraclitus); in the first half or middle of the fifth century (Charon of Lampsacus, Anaximenes, Herodotus); and finally, in the second half of the fifth century (Pherecydes of Athens, Democritus, Hellanicus, and the older writers of the *Corpus Hippocraticum*).

It should be observed that the Ionic writers who were active in Athens in the fifth century not only had Homer and lyric at their disposal, but also Attic tragedy and comedy; and those who were active at the end of the century, Attic prose. At any rate, from the period of the Persian wars, Attic was known to all of them. I have discussed this with respect to the Sophists.

Indeed, towards the mid-fifth century we find Atticisms in Ionic inscriptions, as well as Ionicisms in the Attic ones, cf. A. López Eire 1984b, p. 340 ff. This is the core of the matter, a century after Ionic prose had tried to impose itself in the sixth century, dispensing as far as possible with epic influence. Indeed, it was in the second half of the fifth century that it received a great universalist impulse, being already invaded by Attic elements. In the mid-fifth century, Athens dominated Greek politics and also, through theatre, Greek poetry.

Yet it is difficult, as I have stated, to make detailed judgements about the language of writers of whom we know so little. But let us begin with the older authors, who predate the moment in which Athens peaked.

196. No literal fragments have survived of the works of Thales, Pythagoras, Anaximander and Anaximenes, among others, and there are only minimal fragments of Alcmaeon. We are better served by Pherecydes of Syros, thanks to a papyrus of some fifteen lines, and Heraclitus, whose literal quotes are numerous (but almost invariably in the form of maxims); the same applies to Democritus, who is from

the Athenian age, but for whom there are serious problems of authenticity.

Let us deal with a previous problem regarding the Atticisms that appear in Ionic writers in the fifth century, such as Pherecydes of Athens and Hellanicus, but especially, as we shall see, Herodotus and Hippocrates. It is sometimes postulated that these Atticisms come from the later textual tradition, other times that they were already present in the original texts of these authors. The real answer is probably a mixture of the two: the later tradition multiplied the original Atticisms. When citations come from a variety of sources, as is frequently the case, we can clearly see the hesitation between Ionicism and Atticism.

It could be said that, at least until the Persian wars, these writers would have had a command of an Ionic without Atticisms, which would have gradually entered as the two dialects began to contaminate each other; and would have increased in the manuscript tradition, particularly in some of its later branches.

197. This problem aside, and before dealing with the central subject of epic forms, we should draw attention to two important characteristics of this prose:

(a) Philosophic prose, above all, has an abundance of abstracts (particularly in -ίη and substantivised neuters with or without an article). Many are semantic innovations or pure and simple creations based on common or, at times, epic language. This is a subject that must be considered separately, when we discuss the creation of the Greek scientific language (also in philosophical poetry). For the first time, a linguistic instrument had been created that was able to serve abstract thought. This included the creation of new compositional structures, most certainly that of the scientific treatise.

(b) There is a proliferation of a series of figures of speech, which were later continued in the first Attic prose, in order to compensate for the lack of dactylic rhythm and to elevate the level of the prose ('the style should be clear and solemn', σεμνός, according to Diogenes of Apolonia B1). E. Norden in 1898 already recognized this and subsequently it has been confirmed by all scholars.

> These figures of speech are alliteration, repetition, word play, parallelism, chiasmus and paratactic constructions (the so-called λέξις εἰρομένη, although we have few examples outside of Herodotus). With all this, a narrative prose was created which was both clear and capable of establishing relations, and, also, expressive and capable of enhancing these elements.

To cite a few examples:

> *Alliterations and repetitions*: Pherecyd. Syr. 1, ἐγένετο γῆ . . . γῆν γέρας; Heraclit. B 53, πόλεμος πάντων μὲν πατήρ ἐστί, πάντων δὲ βασιλεύς; Anaxag. B 12, γνώμην γε περὶ παντός πᾶσαν ἴσχει; Pherecyd Ath. 105, ἔθυε τῷ Ποσειδῶνι ὁ Πελίας, καὶ προεῖπε πᾶσι παρεῖναι, Hellanic. 54, ἄνω τῆς ἀκάνθου τοῦ ἄνθεος . . . αἰεὶ ἀνθέουσι.
> *Word play:* Heraclit. B 25, μόροι γὰρ μέζονες μέζονας μοίρας λαγχάνουσι.
> *Parallelism*: Heraclit. B 1, καὶ τοὺς μὲν θεοὺς ἔδειξε, τοὺς δὲ ἐλευθέρους; Anaxag. B 12, καὶ ἀποκρίνεται ἀπό γε τοῦ ἀραιοῦ τὸ πυκνὸν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ψυχροῦ τὸ θερμόν.
> *Chiasmus*: Anaxag. B 12, ἐπὶ δὲ πλέον περιχωρεῖ καὶ περιχωρήσει ἐπὶ πλέον.
> *Paratactic style*: it combines the previous resources with clauses united by δέ, καί, γάρ, etc.; cf. for example, Hecat. 15, Heraclit 1, Democrit 191.

These figures of speech are rarest in Hecataeus and the logographers, and in Democritus. These authors went the furthest in their search for a style without adornment.

198. We still have to deal with the subject of epic's influence, which is derived from its penetration in all the literary languages and from the fact that both history and philosophy originate in Homer, Hesiod, and the rest of Hexametric poetry.

To begin with, we certainly come across hexametric remnants, although some are clearer than others and some may be accidental. For instance, those that appear in Hecataeus or Pherecydes of Athens. We also find, for example, in Heraclit. 1, καὶ ἐπέων καὶ ἔργων, εὖρος ποδὸς ἀνθρωπείου; 35, εὖ μάλα πολλῶν; Hellanic. 26, εὖ μάλα εἰδόμενοι; Pherecyd. Syr. 1, Ζὰς μὲν καὶ Χρόνος ἦσαν; etc.

But the lexicon and phraseology is of greater significance: frequently, the two go hand in hand, as in the start of the work by Hecataeus: Ἑκαταῖος Μιλήσιος ὧδε μυθεῖται (and in Demetr. *De eloc.* 2).

Yet, phraseology aside, the harvest of epic words (or common words with epic forms) or of epic expressions is indeed great. Sometimes, we are dealing with poetic words in general. Some examples:

Acusilaus: ἦεν, πολεμέεσκεν.
Heraclit.: ἀείζωος, ἄθυρμα, ἀρηίφατος, κλέος ἀέναον, ψευδῶν, τέκτονες.
Democr.: ἀτηρός, δαήμων, οἶτος, ὀλοοίτροχος, πολιήτης.
Hecat.: ἀρήγειν, οὔνομα, οὖρεα.
Pherecyd. Ath.: ἄχεος, δέπας, ἐρύκει, οὖδος.

Thus, there is no doubt about the influence of epic and poetry, unequal as it may be, and about the 'new style' (with earlier precedents) of parallelism, antithesis, repetition, etc. which would reach its peak in Attic prose with Gorgias.

Herodotus

199. Let us now turn to Herodotus, who, with the physicians, succeeded in diffusing Ionic as the language of culture throughout Greece, starting from a few small cities and a small island in Asia (Halicarnassus, Cnidus and Cos).

The writers mentioned above provided a precedent. They were Ionians whose work was diffused throughout Greece, especially in Athens, where many of them lived, and non-Ionians, such as Acusilaus of Argos, Hellanicus of Mytilene and Alcmaeon of Croton, who also wrote in Ionic.

With such precedents, before the writers of Ionic made the move to Attic, another generation of writers from a small corner of Asia – Herodotus, Ctesias, Hippocrates and other physicians – had made the move from Doric to Ionic, converting it into the only prose-style of Greek culture. All of them were cosmopolitan individuals, born after the Persian wars. Exiled from Halicarnassus, Herodotus lived in Samos, an Ionic island, and later travelled in Athens, the Persian empire, Italy, and Sicily. He lived until the first years of the Peloponnesian War. Ctesias was a physician in the Persian court and, like Hippocrates, lived until at least the end of the fifth century. It is believed that Hippocrates had contact with the main intellectuals of his time. In any case, the physicians travelled and received students from all parts.

It is not strange that men such as these should have looked for a dialect that was accessible to all the Greeks, as their predecessors had done so before them. Herodotus represents a shift from a mythical to a critical and historical mentality, from localism to universalism: on the basis of small *logoi* on a particular city or village, from *periēgēseis* or *peripluses* and from novelistic narratives, Herodotus articulated (without violating any of these) a universal history directed at all the Greeks. In turn, the physicians also addressed all men. Their doctrine was based on the study of human nature and broke with traditional magical beliefs regarding the origin of disease.

It should be emphasised that a universal language was as necessary as it had been in the case of the language of epic or elegy, only now it had to be a prose language. The choice was clear: the oldest prose had emerged in Ionia, and it was in Ionia or its proximities where these authors lived and where their audience could be found. Ionic was understood in Attica and the whole of Greece, and it linked up with the artificial, Ionicising languages of poetry. And it entered into ever greater symbiosis with Attic, which would end up displacing it as the literary language.

In this way, the development of the literary languages went hand in hand with the phenomenon of Greek internationalism, the Panhellenic character of this culture. The only step that remained to be taken was the replacement of Ionic by Attic.

200. But to return to Ionic and, firstly, Herodotus. The logographers who preceded him wrote on the themes to which I have referred and wrote in Ionic, which contained certain epic echoes. Herodotus followed their example. However, he was still closer to epic than they had been: the composition of his history imitates that of the *Iliad*, and his purpose in writing it (I, 1), to ensure that 'great and admirable events' were not forgotten, provides a further parallel with the epic poems which narrated the 'glory of the heroes'. There is much of epic in Herodotus, and also of tragedy, as I have discussed in other works (Adrados 1966, p. 317 ff., 1994d, p. 83 ff.).

Therefore, it is not surprising that Herodotus's language should have given the ancient critics the impression of being mixed, poetic and Homerising, something which was discussed earlier (§§ 134 and 193): Hermogenes, *De id.* II 399 regards Herodotus's language as 'mixed' and 'poetic', as opposed to that of Hecataeus; Longinus 13, 3

describes it as 'very Homeric'. There was no doubt a difference in degree with some of his predecessors.

A good part of this is attested in Herodotus's text: we find archaic and recent Ionicisms, Atticisms, words of various origins and, in effect, epicisms. The problem is that the text displays incoherences of which we are unsure to what extent they come from Herodotus himself or from the manuscript tradition (including the papyrus tradition).

201. In our manuscripts of Herodotus, there is a coexistence of archaic and recent as well as Ionic and Attic variants, whether epic or not. It is believed that the archetypes of the two principal families date from the first or second century AD, so that their coincidencies should date from at least the Hellenistic period; sometimes the papyri coincide, whereas other times they contain a purer text, but not exempt from the same doublets. For more details, see the books by M. Untersteiner 1947 and H. B. Rosen 1962.

It is clear that the Greek of Ionic inscriptions is partly different, yet it is difficult to establish linguistic use in contemporary Ionia in any decisive way. Cf. Ch. Favre 1914 and K. Stüber 1996. According to H. B. Rose 1962, p. 253, the dialect of Cos and Halicarnassus is closest to Herodotus: but this is not certain. A. López Eire 1984b, previously cited, insists on the penetration of Attic elements from the middle of the century, p. 336 ff. (and of Ionic elements in Attic inscriptions, p. 341 ff.).

202. It is believed that a good part of Herodotus's 'anomalies', particularly those of the archaic or epic type, are due to Herodotus himself; and, no doubt, also some Atticisms, although it is likely that the later tradition reinforced this. But to assume that Herodotus always used a uniform language – for example, with always contracted or uncontracted vowels, with the Ac. sg. of the masc. of the 1st declination always in -ην, the D. pl. of the 2nd always in -οισι, the Ac. pl. of nouns in -ις always in -ῑς is to ignore the fact that in all Greek literary languages there have always existed phonetic variants and polymorphism, as well as an alternation of the archaic and the contemporary.

There are cases in which the orthography of the period, that is, the ancient Ionic alphabet, indicates that the οὔνομα of the manuscripts or the hesitation οὖρος/ὅρος are recent: this alphabet wrote O, and did not distinguish ου from ο and, of course, did not have a sign at its disposal to mark the *spiritus asper*. Contradictory tendencies – epicising, Ionicising, Atticising – were operative while not evident in every step. Of course, without coherence. But they no

doubt maintained certain features of Herodotus's language, for we certainly encounter epicisms and Atticisms, not to mention Ionicisms, which predominate.

It is useful to study the language of Ionic inscriptions, but this does not solve all of our problems: as I have already pointed out, it offers coincidences with Ionic. For example, in the inscriptions we generally find -οισι in D. pl. of the 2nd, but we also find -οις in Halicarnassus in the fifth century: this therefore confirms Herodotus; and also other Ionicisms such as the G. sg. in -ου of proper nouns in -ης. On the other hand, this language writes Εμι, ποιΕν, which attests to the existence of a contraction that sometimes appears in Herodotus, sometimes does not: he has -έε, -έεσθαι, -έεν. There are hesitations too in other vocalic groups. No doubt, Herodotus archaicised on the model of Homer or of the survival in Ionic of certain vowels in hiatus, such as -εο- (but in Herodotus there are also contracted forms, Ion. -ευ-, At. -ου-). He also certainly archaicised in using νηός 'temple' and in various forms with -η- of the noun for 'ship'; there is fluctuation in Homer himself, whereas in Herodotus it is the manuscripts that fluctuate.

Fluctuations may be Ionic, such as that of the Ac. sg. of the masc. of the 1st, already cited, between -ην and -εα: these are not attested, but the G. sg. -εω/-ευς is. In Ac. pl. we find πόλῑς beside πόλιας in the literary texts, not just in Herodotus; this could be old, but there are doubts concerning At. πόλεις, perhaps a recent introduction.

These are not the only cases in which there is a fluctuation between Ionic and Attic forms, cf. for example, R. Hiersche 1970, p. 189 ff., A. López Eire 1984b, p. 337.

Thus, I believe that the conception of Herodotus's language as mixed and poetic, with Attic elements, is correct. But it means that in the course of transmission, the presence of these elements became accentuated, although we cannot fix any exact limits.

203. Thus, we can speak in terms of various sectors of Herodotus's language, including the lexicon.

(a) Ionic sector. This is the most frequent, and it includes the almost omnipresent η for ᾱ (there are some explicable cases of ᾱ, cf. R. Hiersche 1970, p. 203), the predominance of the D. pl. -οισι, inflection in -ις/-ιος, the perf. and plusq. 3rd pl. -αται, -ατο, psilosis (only in remnants), the lexicon and so many other things. I have discussed the possible variants and archaisms which rely upon epic.

(b) Epic and Homericising sector. Obviating to what extent this sector may have been extended by tradition, it exists, of course, and is justified by the reasons mentioned above. But the Homerisms are much more limited than they are in poetry; for example, there is no G. in -οιο except in transcribed oracular hexameters, no 'Aeolicisms' of the κεν type, or outdated archaisms. It is a question of a light Homeric hint or taste.

In morphology, we can attribute the very rare D. pl. in -εσσι to this influence, as well as the apocopated preposition and preverb ἀν-, iteratives such as ἔχεσκε, formations such as πολιήτης (but also πολίτης), and, above all, numerous words and expressions: see note, ἀμείβετο, ἀμφίπολος, ἀτρεκέως, καταλέξω, εὖτε, θυμαλγέα ἔπεα, etc.

There is also Homeric influence in phraseology, as for example when Syagrus replies to the pretensions of Gelon of Syracuse (VII 159, cf. *Il.* VII 125) or when the Lydian king Pittheus replies to Xerxes (VII 28).

(c) The Attic sector (justified by the fact that Herodotus, who admired the city, resided there, cf. VII 139, and by the growing confluence of both dialects). I have already discussed the contraction -ου, and I would have to add aspiration instead of psilosis in ἄφες, etc., νοσέω beside νοῦσος, some particular rare duals, a contaminated form such as θωῦμα (from Ion. θῶμα and At. θαῦμα), the lexicon, for example, ἀπολογέομαι, ναύκρᾱροι, δωροδοκέω, ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ, καραδοκέω; and the inclusion of tragic words, such as δειματόω, δράμημα. This anticipates not only the arrival of Attic as a literary dialect, but also the creation of *koine.*

(d) The foreign sector. Being a traveller with an impenitent curiosity, Herodotus introduced words of various origins: Egyptian (πίρωμις 'gentleman', κυλλῆστις 'bread', καλάσιρις 'dress'), Persian (ἄγγαρος 'post', ἀκινάκης, 'scimitar'), Median (σπάκα 'dog'), Scythian (ἄσχυ, 'a fruit'), Lybian (ζεγέριες, 'hill'), Phrygian (βέκος 'bread'). He was also familiar with various technical terms from the Greek dialects.

204. We must conclude that Herodotus's dialect restricted epicism much more than the previous literary language, that of elegy. It followed the path initiated in this respect by iambos and yet it does not represent the totality of the Ionic language. Within it, there are less Homerising sectors, as represented by some of the logographers and also medical writers, see §§ 205 ff. As regards Atticism, Herodotus

is associated with the group that introduced it in a moderate way, within the cultural and political climate known to us, although the later tradition no doubt reinforced this feature. Hippocrates, as we shall see, inclined more towards Attic.

Herodotus represented real progress with regard to the construction of the phrase within the so-called paratactic style or λέξις εἰρομένη, which, for the earlier Ionic literature, only rare examples remain. Yet, for Herodotus we can provide ample examples because his work has been preserved. In fact, there are entire volumes dedicated to this theme, such as those of G. Stinger 1957 (epic elements), E. Lamberts 1967 (parataxis), I. Beck 1971 (ring composition) and D. G. Müller 1980 (sentence construction in general). Advancing on a base of parataxis, participles of various construction, ring composition and constant reference to terms of the preceding phrase, as well as a certain degree of subordination, Herodotus's prose departed from the artificial methods of some of his Ionic predecessors: the parallelisms, alliterations, etc. But we should add that Herodotus was capable of constructing a hypotactic period where necessary: we only need to look at the first paragraph of his work, in which a main clause is followed by a final clause organised into antithetic members.

However, Herodotus never managed to break with the traditional epic construction based on digressions and constant changes in setting. Only with Thucydides would we arrive at a composition obeying a strict chronology and organisation.

But his organisation of the paragraph constituted a break in which he was certainly following authors such as Hecataeus and which anticipated the break that would be made by Attic prose at some point, surpassing Gorgian prose. These were the origins of narrative and scientific prose, in which the physicians, in addition to the philosophers and Sophists, played an important role. We will briefly refer to the physicians below, but the subject will be dealt with in a separate chapter.

The ancient Hippocratics

205. The case of Ionic in the oldest writings of the *Corpus Hippocraticum*, from the last part of the fifth century BC, differs to a certain extent, but not in essence: fundamentally, we are dealing with the writings *On Airs, Waters, Places, On Ancient Medicine, On the Sacred Disease, Epidemics*

I–III and *Prognostic*. There is a consensus of scholarly opinion against the attempts of editors such as Kühlewein to completely Ionicise the language of these treatises, and it is widely acknowledged that the mixture of Ionic and Attic forms in the manuscripts is certainly due to some extent to the authors themselves, although in this case too there is an increase in Atticisms in the manuscripts.

For a general overview see, for example, R. Hiersche 1970, p. 188 ff. and A. López Eire 1984b, p. 338 ff. and 1992. Herodotus's epicisms are absent: forms without augment, iteratives in -εσκον, ἤνεικα. We find, though more rarely, doublets based on the preservation of forms from earlier literature: there is πιέειν beside δειπνεῖν (but more rarely). There are also similar alternations between Ionic and Attic forms (-οῖσι, -αῖσι/οῖς, -αῖς; σύν/ξύν; μέζον/μεῖζον; οὖλος but ὅλος; νοῦσος but νοσέω) and there are Attic forms such as ἑαυτόν, δεξιᾷ, etc.

Now, the degree of Atticisation in the texts of the ancient physicians is greater than in Herodotus. There is more contraction in -ει-, οὖν, γοῦν (not ὦν, γῶν), ἔθεσαν (not forms with -κ-), des. of the 3rd pl. in -ασι (before the type ἱεῖσι), G. pl. of the 1st -ιῶν, πολύς and not πολλός, ἀπόδειξις (not -δεξις), μέγεθος (not μέγαθος), ἄρσην (not ἔρσην), ἱερός is frequent, etc. Some new formations are based on Attic, such as νόσημα.

Thus, we are dealing with the same mixed dialect that linked the triumph of Ionic with the growing influx of Attic, as seen in the inscriptions and in Herodotus. A. López Eire 1992 has studied certain passages in which Ionic and Attic are closely related.

As would be expected, a few Doric elements entered: ποτί, αὐτός, αὐτόν, etc. It is certain that a standardised Ionic prose was not formed, but there was a clear shift from a pure Ionic towards an Atticised Ionic. The last step was that taken by Gorgias: the formation of an Attic language.

But, aside from the essential feature of Hippocrates's language – a scientific lexicon and a scientific compositional structure, which shall be discussed later – we find here for the very first time (given that our knowledge of the earlier Ionic prose is incomplete) what R. Palmer 1980, p. 142 refers to as 'the first fully developed prose style'. Its features do not differ so much from those of Herodotus: ring composition, anaphoric recapitulations, repetitions, dominance of parataxis, cf. O. Wenskuns 1982.

In other words, in Herodotus and in the first Hippocratics, primitive prose based on alliterations, parallelisms and diverse figures of speech was replaced by a broader, essentially paratactic prose based on ring composition and continuous references to the future and to the past. This phenomenon later occurred in Attic, when Gorgianic prose, related to primitive Ionic prose, gave way to the extended period, whether paratactic or hypotactic.

3. The transformation of the Attic dialect into a literary language

Attic as an oral dialect

206. As we have seen, a dialect to which we refer as Ionic-Attic existed within southern Greek. Around the year 1000 BC, this dialect received some isoglosses from Doric. Its innovations, among which the most notable is the shift from ᾱ to η, are from a later date. The shift from -ήων to -έων and the metathesis of quantity νηός > νεώς are dated even later.

But a certain amount of isolation and differentiation occurred between the Ionic of Ionia, the Ionic of the islands, Attic, and the dialect of Euboea. For example, this dialect did not convert *u* > *ü*; where Attic contracted the vowels, Ionic did not do so. It did not lengthen vowels preceding groups of sonant and digamma (ξένος, not ξεῖνος), it converted -ρσ > -ρρ-, converted the ᾱ back to η after ρ, ι, ε, accepted Boeotian -ττ- for -σσ-, etc. It maintained (although not without exceptions) peculiar forms such as ξύν beside σύν, εἰς beside ἐς. Furthermore, it distanced itself increasingly in the course of its internal history: it ended up preferring (after initial hesitations) εἰς to ἐς, -οῖς to -οῖσι, etc. Indeed, in an older work of mine (Adrados 1953a–57) I thought I could indicate a series of Attic differenciations in the lexical area.

Attic was a species of provincial Ionic, with some very special characteristics which even the Atticist writers, much later, would avoid. Athens was a small city which only began to gain recognition abroad with Solon and Pisistratus, a recognition which increased when it founded a democracy and liberated itself from Spartan influence; and especially when it acquired an essential role in the Persian wars and, later, led the Maritime League, from 477 onwards.

From this moment on, Athens became very closely related to the Ionic world, so that there was a reciprocal influence between the two dialects: we have seen how from the mid-fifth century on there were Atticisms in Ionic inscriptions and Ionicisms in Attic ones: I will elaborate on this in § 243. *Koine* was definitively formed: an Attic held together by some of its more peculiar characteristics and with certain Ionic, pan-Greek and even Doric features. After its split, Ionic-Attic underwent a new unification.

Yet, however politically important Athens may have been, particularly from the Persian wars onwards, and however attractive it was to the Greek intellectual world, Attic was not yet the language of prose. Athenians such as Pherecydes wrote in Ionic: Attic was not yet 'salonfähig' as J. Niehoff-Panagiotidis 1994, p. 199 puts it (theatre is another matter, see § 209). Indeed, foreigners living in Athens and all those who wrote prose did so in Ionic. As mentioned above, they certainly would have spoken in Attic in the streets, just like Socrates and the orators at the Assembly and the tribunals, but they wrote in Ionic: for instance, Pherecydes, Democritus, Protagoras and presumably the rest of the Sophists. Two foreigners, Gorgias of Leontini – already mentioned – and Thrasymachus of Chalcedon, put an end to this anomaly when they created Attic prose in the twenties of the fifth century. However, this did not mean that Ionic disappeared entirely, for it was cultivated in the fourth century by the physicians Metrodorus de Chios and Ctesias, among others, although they were in the minority.

207. On the Attic dialect, see §§ 117f. and A. López Eire 1984a, 1985 and 1987b; also, my early work of 1953a–57 already cited. We now have good descriptions on the Attic of the inscriptions: on phonology, the first volume of L. Threatte 1980, A. Lupas 1972 and S. Theodorsson 1974; on morphology, see the second volume of Threatte, 1996. A. López Eire 1994 provides a description of the evolution of Attic through the inscriptions. In addition, see A. Thumb–A. Scherer II 1959 (with many references). On vulgar Attic, see P. Kretschmer 1894 and W. Rabehl 1906 (the *tabellae defixionis*). On the strata of Attic, A. Thumb 1974, p. 202 ff. and J. Niehoff-Panagiotidis 1994, p. 195. On literary Attic, R. Hiersche 1970, p. 207 ff., 152 ff., V. Bers 1983, besides the monographic studies. E. des Places 1934 is interesting. On double forms in Attic, see in particular A. López Eire 1986, 1991 (Aristophanes) and 1984 (Thucydides). These double forms sometimes anticipate *koine*, see § 226 for their presence in Xenophon, the late Plato and in Aristotle.

Sources

208. From what base did Gorgias and Thrasymachus make their transcendental leap? Of course, from the normal dialect of the period, filled with poetic and intellectual influences, some of which would have been very much at hand and unavoidable in Athens. But, apart from that, there existed a written Attic that was spread over three different sectors:

(a) Inscriptions. These were usually official or, at any rate, written in a formulaic and standard language, although we also encounter graffitti and different manifestations of vulgar Attic, as in the vase inscriptions studied by P. Kretschmer 1894. Here, we find forms used by the lower sectors of the population, as well as by foreign craftsmen.

But it is important to note that, the more elevated official or private inscriptions, despite their formalism, do not display a unified language: they contain multiple variants, see for example the data on doublets such as ἐς/εἰς, ξύν/σύν, -οισι(ν)/-οις, -ησι/-αις, γέγονα/γεγένημαι, -νυμι/-νύω, ἔδομεν/ἐδώκαμεν, etc., and they only correspond to chronology in part. All of this is in accordance with the variants found in various writers: for example, Aristophanes and Thucydides (see the works of A. López Eire referred to in the previous note). But the inscriptions were not very numerous: many dialects were used for epigraphic, not literary, purposes.

(b) Tragedy. This is indeed a precedent: it is Attic iambos (with certain Homerisms and Ionicisms) coming from Solon, and even from Attic skolia. Here there definitely existed a literary Attic, a continuation of the literary Ionic of the iambos: a language definitely intended to be recited.

My theory (see, in particular, Adrados 1983a), which is of course impossible to argue in any great length here, is that certain mimetic and dramatic choruses, specialised in the mythic themes which were later referred to as tragic, had become an itinerant spectacle which presented various themes: the members of the chorus were occasionally transformed into actors and entered into dialogue with each other. These would be the Doricising choruses that Thespis brought to the Panathenaea festivals, at the request of Pisistratus in the year 534; with just one actor (a specialised chorus singer) in the beginning, we are told.

There was no fusion of the Doric chorus and the Ionic iambos, no artificial fusion of two independent genres, as has sometimes been suggested. In Athens, if one chorus singer or actor abandoned the song (in 'Doric') to recite *iamboi* (very few in the beginning, but more when two and then three actors were introduced) he would have had a obvious model in Sólon. It was a great innovation. It is clear that an archaic Attic of the sixth century, with poetic influences, was used. I will provide details later.

(c) Comedy (perhaps earlier, in satyrical drama). The iambos of comedy and Ionic iambos have the same spirit, both having flourished in similar festivals. It is not surprising that in the festive *pendant* of the tragedy that is comedy, created fifty years later in 485, *iamboi* were recited in the colloquial and, at times, vulgar style of those festivals. It was a literary language which could adapt itself to various dialects: also to Syracusan, and in this case, to Attic. Indeed, why look further afield for something that could be found within? Yet this was not a prose language but rather a poetic language of a colloquial kind.

Characteristics

209. It should be stressed that this did not yet constitute prose as such, but it provided a base for those who would go on to create it. This base consisted of two different levels or registers: the solemn and remote register of tragedy and the colloquial and familiar (even vulgar) register of comedy. When prose was created there was some hesitation about which register to follow: the hesistations which, after Gorgias, gave rise to the different literary levels of Attic, as we shall see.

We have seen how the choruses of tragedy only preserved a few remnants of the traditional language of choral lyric, and that they already displayed an Attic influence. G. Björck 1950 and particularly R. Hiersche 1980, p. 147 ff., have stressed this. Yet, the *iamboi* (and trochaic trimeters) of tragedy are closer to the common Attic language, although they are very distant from colloquial, not to mention vulgar language, displaying as they do a distance appropriate to a religious language. I have discussed this in Adrados 1975c.

So, the theories regarding the Ionic origin of tragedy's dialogue have not always provided us with valuable perspectives. I refer the

reader to R. Hiersche, as cited previously, with regard to the issue of the 'elevated' language of tragedy, its polymorphism, the influence of epic language and the scarcity of Ionic elements.

The fact is that we are dealing fundamentally with Attic. I have proposed (Adrados 1953a–57) that certain 'glosses' and anomalous forms which are qualified as Homeric or Ionic are simply archaic Attic, dating from the birth of tragedy. Why should a form such as -οισι be necessarily Homeric or Ionic, when it is also present in Attic inscriptions? Why, too, should θεσμός be necessarily so, when used by Solon, or ἄποινα, when used by Draco? I have emphasised this point in the article cited previously, cf. Adrados 1957, p. 116. No doubt, these terms were later eliminated from Attic prose, but some survived in popular language and passed into *koine*, as proposed by A. Thumb 1974. I believe in the 'subterranean' existence, so to speak, of a series of words, often Ionic at the same time, which would emerge in the late Plato and in Xenophon and would spread into *koine*; or would otherwise enter it directly.

This 'subterranean' lexicon is only a part of conversational Attic, which was able to flourish in the tragedy, the comedy, and in Thucydides, but was not admitted into Attic prose (or even the literary transcription of the language of Socrates). It undoubtedly formed part of the great Attic dialect, which will be discussed further on, and then entered the *koine*.

It is notable that part of that lexicon was at the same time archaic, dating from a period in which the subsequent regularisation had not yet occurred. For this reason, it had the prestigious allure of high poetry, which was even more reason for it to be rejected by prose. It also provided tragedy with a polymorphism which was not only useful but also similar to that of all Greek poetry.

However, it is clear that certain Atticisms that were felt to be provincialisms did not have prestige, as for example -ττ- and -ρρ-, which tended to be avoided in poetry. The language of tragedy, being Attic, functioned in the way that all Greek poetic languages functioned.

The same applies with respect to the different syntactic features of tragedy, also shared by other poetry, which are also at the same time Attic archaisms: the use of number (the 'poetic plural'), moods without ἄν, etc. Cf., V. Bers 1983 (and A. C. Moorhouse 1982, Adrados 1992d, p. 285).

The problem lies in the fact that the oldest tragedy dates from 472, sixty years after the birth of the genre. But the conclusion seems clear.

Naturally, the language of tragedy evolved from Aeschylus to Euripides, and was able, at times, to adopt colloquial tones and nuances which were more or less comparable to those of some prose writers. This has been studied in Euripides by P. T. Stevens 1976, but it was already referred to by Aristotle, *Rhetorica* 1404 b 24. Indeed, it is evident that the theatre, starting with tragedy, was a model for the oldest Attic prose and for Socratic dialogue.

210. The study of the language of comedy encounters an even greater obstacle than that of the tragedy: the oldest preserved comedy, the *Acharnians* by Aristophanes, dates from the year 425 and is contemporary with the oldest prose. Nevertheless, Aristophanes is essential for the study of the colloquial and vulgar registers of Attic and its phonetic, morphological, lexical and syntactic variants; also, for the study of the comic resources of the language. I have cited two works by A. López Eire, to which I add another of 1996a on colloquial language in Aristophanes; and a book by Anagnostopulos (1923) as well as a thesis, published in a summary, by E. Rodríguez Monescillo (1975).

Aristophanes (who for us, in practice, is almost the sole representative of the comedy) was an artist in his use of language, who used a parody of different poetic languages and dialects, different registers, and of the polymorphism that was permitted by Attic. He gave the use of the latter such flexibility that he no doubt smoothed the way for prose writers when, rejecting the poeticizing rigidity of a writer like Gorgias, they tried to approach the common language and all its resources. This was something new, without precedent in Greece, but it should again be stressed that Aristophanes reflected a popular language that was not yet regularised in prose.

211. This is the scene that the creators of the Attic language encountered. Of course, one should not forget the knowledge of the Attic that was spoken in the Assembly and in the tribunals, as well as in the sophistic debates: although here, it seems, with the new resources of the antilogical style and the new intellectual lexicon which passed into prose. This is the Attic which is more or less accessible to us through the routes I have outlined; but also, although it may appear

strange, through another route, namely through Socrates: a comparison of the different Socratic sources makes his language accessible to a certain extent, cf. Adrados 1992a. Although now I believe that not all his language is made accessible: a certain degree of deformation by Plato and Xenophon, in order to adapt it to contemporary prose, is highly plausible, although I believe very rare.

The sources through which we know Socrates (mainly Plato, Xenophon and Aristophanes) filter his ideas in different directions, yet this does not apply so much to his language, judging by the similarities between them. For instance, they share the feature of the dialogue, instead of the monologue; although not literary dialogue, such as that of the Socratics, but rather a dialogue of free conversation which jumps from one topic to the other in different contexts. It is a colloquial language, avoiding both the vulgar and the 'elevated' style of the Sophists, which Socrates parodied (particularly the Gorgianic). It is also a language displaying a uniformity of register.

Socrates, as he himself tells us in the Platonic *Apology* (17), spoke in the same language that he used in the agora and the counters of the moneychangers. A distinguishing feature of his language is the question and answer model rather than uninterrupted discourse; also, paraenesis (the use of the voluntative and imperative), exclamations, the constant vocatives with which he directs himself to his interlocutor; and there is not a lack of emotional moments.

Common words are always used, comparisons and similes, ironic and parodic moments, anecdotes, fables and myths, paradoxes. In addition, there is the use of polite attenuation: its constant 'perhaps', its potential instead of indicative, parenthesis with verbs of opinion, the replacement of assertion with interrogation, excuses, impersonal forms.

Almost invariably, we are dealing with short phrases, with minor hypotaxis; only rarely does a conditional lead the phrase, or does a final clause conclude it; clauses that are temporal or of another type are introduced asymmetrically, as well as some genitive absolutes. There are interruptions and anacolutha.

Thus, the language of Socrates is very representative of the language of the street, and is not far removed from many passages by Aristophanes. It not only avoids vulgarism, but also preciosity, poeticism, antilogy and long hypotactic periods. It was the starting point of educated conversation in Athens: colloquial spoken language, not

prose. But often his very method of discovery led him to develop special uses of common words such as φρόνησις (the new Socratic virtue), ἐπιμέλομαι 'to take care of, or occupy oneself with', θεραπεία 'the care' (especially of the soul), ἐλέγχω 'refute, convince', ἐξετάζω 'examine', etc.

Beside this, there was vulgar Attic, which we know from the language of the vases studied by P. Kretschmer and referred to by A. Thumb – which was filled with haplologies, dissimilations, and other phonetic accidents (some anticipating *koine*, such as ὀλίος) and admitted many foreign words. Pseudo-Xenophon, in the Constitution of Atenas II 8, acknowledges this mixture. It passed into *koine* to a certain extent.

Thus, spoken Attic had set aside the literary Attic of the iambos; and it was not unitary, for it contained different strata, of which we have little knowledge. Attic prose largely maintained a series of concurrent forms. Indeed, it sometimes rejected Atticisms such as -ττ- and accepted 'international', Ionic and especially poetic phonetics, morphology or lexicon.

The oldest Attic prose

212. Socrates explored, he did not theorise: he was not tempted to write treatises. In fact, he lived in a context of oral literature peculiar to Athens, where poetry was heard in the theatre, in banquets, schools; where the discourses in the Assembly and the tribunals were neither written nor read; where a visiting foreign philosopher such as Zeno (as recounted by Plato in *Parmenides* 126 b–c) would gather some friends together to read them one of his writings, and where we are told (by Eusebius in his *Chronicle* I 78) Herodotus made his *History* known through a reading.

It is true that in this period one could buy a tragedy or a book by Anaxagoras, but it was strange to have a library, according to Euthydemus (cf. Xenophon, *Mem.* IV 2, 1), and the fact that Euripides had one (cf. Athenaeus 3 A) was considered somewhat eccentric.

The orality of Athenian literature and its taste for debate is related to its culture of democracy, as I have shown in a recent book (Adrados 1997a). It left its mark on the later written literature: on orations, discourses within history books, the Socratic dialogues, etc.; and, of course, on theatre. It also forms the base of the first Attic prose, that of the Sophists and rhetoricians.

It should be noted that these Sophists and rhetoricians represented a new culture, the culture of the book. They debated and dialogued, but they also tended to write discourses that would serve as models, rhetoric 'arts' and treatises on theoretical themes. They followed, as we know, the line of the ancient philosophers who authored their own writings, and the physicians, all of whom wrote in Ionic; they also followed the Sicilian rhetoricians Corax and Tisias (although we do not know in which dialect they wrote).

Indeed, they were important for the continuation of Athenian literature: for oratory, no doubt, but also for historiography, in which Thucydides was very influenced by them; and for the τέχναι and various essays, from 'On the Chorus' by Sophocles to the different essays or discourses on the theme of love in the Platonic *Symposium*. Socratic dialogue was the only purely Athenian genre, with its own singular characteristics.

213. As we saw, Ionic was also used in Athens in the beginning. We have anticipated that in the twenties of the fifth century Gorgias of Leontini, an Ionian city of Sicily, and Thrasymachus of Chalcedon, a Megarian colony in the Bosporus, were inspired both by that literature and by what the Attic of Athens had to offer for the writing of fictitious discourses, rhetorical 'arts' and treatises, all in the Athenian dialect, Attic. Two *Apologiae* by Gorgias have been preserved, that of Palamedes and that of Helen; fragments of an *Epitaphius;* and the treatise *On Not Being.* He also wrote some works which have been lost, namely, speeches such as the *Olympian, Pythian, Eulogy of the Eleans* and a rhetorical *Art.* Another *Art,* also lost, was written by Thrasymachus, to whom a treatise is also attributed, *On the Constitution.*

In this context, the language of these writings is of interest: both with respect to the phonetic and morphological characteristics of their Attic and to the figures of speech and phrase construction, as well as to the lexicon. Also, fundamentally, the language of the epideictic works, the 'economic'.

Gorgias and Thrasymachus created a model of Attic prose which different authors soon struggled to surpass, creating what I will refer to as the second Attic prose. However, the first Attic prose, influenced certainly by figures of speech and other resources of Ionic prose mentioned above (§§ 197 f.), includes Gorgias and Thrasymachus, but strongly influenced, to schematise somewhat, the historian Thucydides, who on his return to Athens from exile in the year 404

wrote in a style strongly influenced by Gorgias in his youth. This prose also influenced the orator Antiphon, whose *Tetralogies* (fictitious discourses in which an accusser and defender take turns) clearly follow the line of Protagoras and Gorgias. These were possibly written around the year 415 BC. But Thucydides and Antiphon, as well as the orator Andocides, fought strongly to free themselves from Gorgianism: they constitute a kind of transition to mature Attic prose, which in Lysias is decidedly anti-Gorgianic. For only in epideictic oratory do Gorgianic characteristics appear here and there. See, on the genre, V. Buchheit 1960.

The small treatise, with oligarchic overtones, 'Constitution of Athens', dated before the Peloponnesian war, is not included in the first Attic prose: it constitutes a first, rather clumsy attempt, before Gorgianic prose. Atticisms such as -ττ- are present, and the substantivisation of the neuters in intellectual prose is still absent.

Also, we have not included the two writings by the Sophist Antiphon, *Concord* and *Truth* (some papyrus fragments still survive of the latter). His identification with Antiphon the orator, defended among others by W. Aly 1987, is dubious, just as the chronology proposed, around the year 439. *Concord* belongs to the epideictic genre and displays an Ionic-poetic language, with the -σσ- and ξύν of the first Atticism; *Truth* is more Atticistic (-ττ-, σύν, Attic vocabulary), but it follows the model of the Presocratic treatises, with badly organised and short members.

Nevertheless, these were the first buddings of Attic prose. The great transformation, its actual creation, was really in the hands of Gorgias and Thrasymachus: some believe that, in the long run, it was more in the hands of the latter who, according to the *Suda*, introduced 'the current style of oratory' (cf. J. D. Denniston 1970, p. 14).

214. Let us now look at some of the characteristics of what we regard as being the oldest Attic prose and the transitional prose. However, it should be noted beforehand that it contains many irregularities and numerous doublets in its phonetics and morphology; also, with regard to figures, construction, and vocabulary, there are differences between the authors. Thucydides is a special case, in which elements of the Gorgianic tradition are combined with various others; similarly with Antiphon. Thus, it is better to treat them separately.

215. See in particular R. Hiersche 1970, p. 208 ff. and the books of A. Thumb 1974 and J. Niehoff-Panagiotidis 1994 as cited; for the lexicon, see my articles Adrados 1953a and 1957. On Thucydides, see B. Rosenkranz 1930, C. Roura 1971, F. R. Adrados 2003, p. 50 ff., O. Hoffmann 1973, p. 176 ff., J. Caveney 1978, L. R. Palmer 1980, p. 152 ff. A joint study is lacking, after that by E. Norden 1898; for Gorgias I can cite the (unpublished) bachelor thesis of A. Durán 1966. The connections between the Gorgianic figures and those of Heraclitus can be seen in G. Rudberg 1942; for links with certain magical texts, see M. García Teijeiro 1988; for other influences, including that of Protagoras, cf. G. Zuntz 1939. On the figures themselves, cf. J. Martin 1974, p. 270 ff. On their place in the history of Attic rhetoric and literary language, see the books cited by V. Buchheit, W. Aly and J. D. Denniston.

There are problems regarding the hesitations of manuscripts and editors, along with problems of interpretation: it has been customary to regard as Ionic certain forms which today are clearly seen to be archaic Attic, especially in Thucydides.

216. The great leap toward writing in Attic prose was not made without concessions: actually, similar concessions were made by the tragedians. The forms -ττ- and -ρρ- only rarely appear in these authors, Ionic and poetic forms (or simply the general forms in the literary dialects) -σσ- and -ρσ- dominating. The point was not to isolate the new literature too much (which would not have been a problem for comedy or, indeed, for more recent Attic prose). Perhaps the desire to maintain the dignity of the prose can be seen in the presence of archaic forms such as ἐάν, ξύν, ἐς, οὕνεκα, ἕνεκεν, παλαιότερος, although these sometimes alternate with modern forms.

The same occurs with at least part of the so-called poetic vocabulary found in tragedy, proceeding from poetry as well as the archaic Attic base. This was discussed above.

In contrast, the proliferation of abstracts in -μα and -σις, which comes from Ionic prose, is the sign of a new age. Also, in particular, the 'figures' which I have discussed in this connection, which attempt to compensate for the lack of verse.

217. Gorgias went further than the Ionians: his small periods (*kommata*) were integrated by tiny units (κῶλα) organised in antithetic pairs, linked by an equal number of syllables (παρίσωσις) and end rhyme (παρομοίωσις, ὁμοιοτέλευτον). Thus, a very artificial style came into being which was later rejected with the creation of longer periods organised on the basis of hypotaxis. Aristotle (*Rhetorica* 1404 a

26 ff.) criticises Gorgias by saying that prose is not the same as poetry. He describes this style as 'poetic'; no doubt, the lexicon contributed to this impression, as well as the continued use of metonymy and metaphors, alliteration and verbal echoes. Apart from this, there is the artificial imposition of a 'corset' which is antithetic to its content.

Thrasymachus went a step further with his use of metric clauses at the beginnings and endings of periods: paeonic rhythms (—⏑⏑⏑ at the beginnings and ⏑⏑⏑— at the endings), and also trochaics and cretics.

In fact, all of later Attic prose grew out of the modification of the Gorgianic style and that of Thrasymachus by Thucydides and Antiphon and its critique by later writers: Plato in the *Gorgias* 467 b, 479 c, *Menexenus* 235 a, *Symposium* 198 a ff.; Isocrates V 27, IX 10, etc. Not to mention the criticism of Euripides of 'too beautiful' words and by Aristophanes against the young enthusiasts of sophistry and Rhetoric in *Clouds* 961 ff., among others.

This criticism was justified by the success that Gorgianic rhetoric enjoyed for some time. Isocrates and Aristotle show this clearly. Plato, for his part, reflects this success in small examples that he includes in his works: various in the *Symposium*, especially the discourse by Agathon; the erotic discourse of Lysias recited by Phaedrus in the dialogue of the same name; etc. Also, above all, it is clearly reflected in Plato's own criticism.

218. The Gorgianic and Thrasymachean construction of periods remained important for Antiphon and also left traces in Thucydides. In particular, its abundance of antithetic expressions, whether used in parallel or oppositionally. Sometimes, it is accompanied by word play, with an exploitation of synonymy.

However, Thucydides is an entirely different case. Elsewhere, I have studied his main characteristics (Adrados 2003, p. xxx ff.). He does not display any complete phonetic or morphological regularisation, he can choose archaisms or Ionicisms (which are sometimes the same thing). There is a lack of short and rhythmic periods and he has not yet acquired the long and well-structured periods of the later prose, whose development came later, due to his exile between 424 and 404. His prose is full of parentheses and anacolutha, of syntactic imprecision. It preserves archaic syntactic uses and, in particular, exploits nominal expression: this comes from the intellectual

base of his work, as does the proliferation of abstracts. Certainly, with some awkwardness, his prose manages to construct extended periods, charged with thought.

So, in Thucydides we find the unification of particular Attic archaisms, a flight from more local Atticism, the influence of the periodic and antithetical style of Gorgias and Thrasymachus, and an attempt to create new modes of expression adapted to the new thought and to the needs of prose development. The antitheses, with some exceptions, are added to the thought, not the reverse, as in Gorgias.

These needs were also felt by a series of writers who extended the intellectual lexicon of Attic and created extended and complex periods based on hypotaxis used in a regular way which became characteristic of a new style, although there were differences between the various schools. Antiphon himself introduced a new style in the composition of the periods.

Mature Attic prose

219. As pointed out earlier, Thucydides and Antiphon should be regarded as authors of a transitional prose that led directly to the great Attic prose style, which only really began to flourish in the fourth century. On the one hand, this prose is decidedly Attic, without any of the concessions to Ionic phonetics, morphology and lexicon of which we have spoken. On the other hand, it gradually renounces Gorgianic trappings and even rhetorical pomposity, as well as vulgarism. It does not always avoid colloquialism, but it has a 'written' style which is essentially different from the oral style. This Attic prose was open to evolution, which begin in the fifth century and lead to the formation of *koine*.

It is important to note that the development of Attic prose is closely related to the development of Athenian literature and the spirit that inspired it. Thucydides, to be sure, was not after brilliance, but after a rigorous exposition of the facts and a rigorous theory: when he proposes that his work is 'a posession for all time and not a competitive piece to be heard for the moment' (I 22), he is, in effect, criticising the rhetoricians, Sophists and historians who aim to please with their mythical and poetical fantasies, whereas he is only after the truth.

These criticisms are shared by Plato when, in the *Gorgias*, he opposes philosophy and rhetoric, and in the *Symposium*, philosophy

and poetry: his Socrates searches for the truth by means of a discourse rid of all artifice. This explains his criticism of Gorgianism.

Isocrates is no different when he describes his stylistic evolution (XII 2) and offers his own criticisms (cf. § 217). He is after *saphéneia,* clarity of exposition, in which everything fits.

But to return to Thucydides, who was on the same path. There is a dominance of narration and argumentation in the impressive part of the prœms and epilogues in the same discourses, cf. F. Romero 1988. With regard to Antiphon, G. Zuntz 1939 has noted the dominance of the narrative and argumentative part over Gorgianic 'adornments', and how for the former he developed his own version of the *léxis eiroméne* or a coordinative version before the *katestramméne* or hypotactic version; but always without a forced regularisation, and avoiding Gorgianic schematism.

Both in Thucydides and Antiphon we occasionally encounter a lexicon which is rather Ionic and poeticising, and which sometimes turns out to be archaic Attic. This would later be rectified in a general way.

220. The Athenian spirit is responsible for three great literary inventions (besides theatre, which I have discussed):

(1) The development of written oratory, mainly forensic and political in nature but also epideictic, with the purpose of persuasion (Gorgias's moto), although through a 'middle' language, as it were, which was neither vulgar nor poeticising.
(2) The creation of the Socratic dialogue, which is known to us above all through Plato and Xenophon. Although it includes mythical and rhetorical passages, it essentially raises spoken dialogue to the literary level. Of course, there are differences: there is true dialectic dialogue in the first period, dialectic and dramatic dialogue in the second (*Protagoras, Gorgias, Symposium, Phaedrus, Phaedo*, etc.) and in the late Plato there is a species of fictitious dialogue, in which the 'yes' replies of the interlocutor do not hide the fact that we are really dealing with an expository treatise.
(3) The creation of a new history, which continued the line of the Ionic histories but aimed for exact narration of political and military facts, without mythical or ethnographic *excursi* or digressions. Also, occasionally, discussing their interpretation.

Thus, the mature Attic prose was created, and it was developed mainly in the fourth century, during a period in which Athens was a secondary power and would soon become a small city within the Hellenistic world. Despite this, a mature prose style developed, displaying an ingenious regularisation, which distances it from the colloquial language of Aristophanes and what remains of it in Thucydides. Underlying the more formalised prose, a freer Attic was stirring which would evolve and give rise to *koine,* expanding throughout the Greek world.

221. A few characteristics of this prose:

(1) The elimination of the excessively vulgar and of certain archaic forms, without renouncing the forms common to Attic, which are not replaced by the Ionic forms. Elimination, too, of certain poeticisms.
(2) A degree of choice in the morphology and syntax (in, for example, Aristophanes and Thucydides), which renounces forms which often emerged later in *koine* (and even earlier, as mentioned previously).
(3) Choice in the lexicon, too, which I studied in my earlier articles: this 'purged' lexicon survived in the popular language and was reintroduced in *koine.* It was a 'subterranean' lexicon, emerging at the end of the Attic period and in *koine.*

Attic prose definitely distanced itself from conversational language: by resorting to Ionicisms, poeticisms, rhetorical figures, etc.; and, subsequently, to various types of choices. Cf. Adrados 1981b, p. 314 ff. There is no difference between the language of the accused and the accusers in Lysias, and there is no attempt to categorise them by their language (the same applies in the case of Aristophanes or Socrates with respect to conversational language). In short, Attic prose maintained the distinction between literary and conversational language which had existed from the beginnings of Greece itself, and in the Hellenistic and Roman periods the same antinomy continued. Similarly, in the modern period, a distinction would be made between a *katharevusa* or 'pure' language and a *dimotiki* or 'popular' language.

222. On the role of prose within Athenian culture, I refer the reader to the works mentioned above (cf. § 215) and especially my book of 1997. For rhetoric, see in particular V. Buccheit 1960 and J. Martin 1974, as

cited previously, as well as O. A. Baumhauer 1986. On the intellectual aspects of Socratic and Platonic philosophy, see various works of mine collected in Adrados 1992d; also, the book cited, *Democracia y literatura en la Atenas clásica*, of 1997. For the style of Attic prose in general, the book by J. D. Denniston 1970 is very important. For the composition of the Platonic dialogues, cf. among others, V. Goldsmith 1963, H. Thesleff 1967, P. Bádenas 1984 (and my Prologue, Adrados 1984d). On the rhythm of Demosthenes, see D. McCabe 1981. On the occasional impact of the colloquial language, see É. des Places 1934, in general; D. Tarrant 1946 and 1958, on Plato; compare also P. T. Stevens 1976, on Euripides. On the composition of Thucydides, see A. Momigliano 1930 (and my Introduction to my translation, Madrid 1984b). The bibliography on the language, style and composition of Attic prose is more scarce than might be expected. Histories of the Greek language, such as those of O. Hoffmann, R. Hiersche and L. R. Palmer, abundantly cited here, go up to Gorgias, Thucydides and Antiphon, and later surprisingly jump to Xenophon.

It should be noted that relatively little remains of Athenian prose of the fourth century. It is true that a large part of oratory has been preserved, but as far as history is concerned, we have only Xenophon and some fragments of Theopompus and Ephorus; so many others are missing. With regard to the Socratics, we are only left with Plato and Xenophon, and precious little of the other thinkers of the fourth century. Also, very little has survived of comedy. Note that the latter as well as the historians and philosophers were not often Athenians at all, only the orators were. But Attic was the language of prose: first in Athens, written by Athenians and non-Athenians, and later in all other parts.

Variants within Attic prose

223. There are enormous internal differences in Attic prose, within the common characteristics which have been discussed.

For instance, with regard to oratory, there is firstly the style of Lysias, in which the logographer has to adapt to the simplicity of his clients, who are uncomfortable in the tribune; secondly, there is the style of certain passionate, political discourses, by Demosthenes; thirdly, the style of the complex of the grand epideictic discourses by Isocrates – the *Panegyricus, Panathenaicus, Areopagiticus* and the rest – with their long hypotactic periods, whose clauses contain others like chinese boxes; their avoidance of the hiatus; and their clauses with paeonic rhythm.

In certain passages – the 'climactic' moment of the discourse *On the Crown* by Demosthenes, or the passage of the procession of souls and the discourse by Diotima in the Platonic *Phaedrus* – the poetic style can resurface in the lexicon, phraseology and the *kola*.

In any case, new and subtle rules of composition – which the orator can break, as flagrantly demonstrated by Demosthenes in *On the Crown* with his second narration –, the possibility of turning to the colloquial or, in contrast, of introducing rhetorical emphasis, as well as the possibility of constructing rather elaborate periods, joins in the service of exposition, argumentation and persuation. Rhetoric was at the centre of Athenian life, and all literature (including theatre and history) was influenced by it. Yet only echoes survive of ancient Gorgianic rhetoric.

The same can be said of the Socratic dialogues, which transformed dialogue (with varying themes) into literature. I have pointed out that the Socratic dialogues could consist of various elements and could be divided into different subgenres, which is clearly demonstrated in Plato. But there is always a pre-established organisation underlying their apparent freedom, leading to a conclusion.

The dialogues of the middle period of Plato's life – starting with the *Protagoras* and the *Gorgias*, towards the year 390 – gave rise to the dramatic dialogue, which can take the form of a comedy or tragedy. Without going into too much detail about its construction (I already cited the bibliography), I would say that we are faced with a new genre in which the dramatic makes use of prose expressions and in which the style is flexible according to need. H. Thesleff 1967 discusses Plato's styles.

Of course, the colloquialism of Socratic discourse, which I discussed, is overcome, but this does not exclude the occasional presence of colloquialisms as appropriate, cf. D. Tarrant 1946 and 1958. Indeed, where necessary (I referred to the *Phaedrus* above), the style can be elevated without resorting to Gorgianic artifice.

Similar observations could be made with respect to history, had more works been preserved for us. I have discussed Thucydides, although something should be added with regard to his composition, cf. for example, A. Momigliano 1930. As regards his successors, we are acquainted with the simplicity of diction and compositional organisation of Xenophon and the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, and perhaps also of Theopompus, whereas a more rhetorical and moralising aspect is attributed to Ephorus. It would seem that, in this way, the two essential lines of Hellenistic historiography were presaged.

224. J. D. Denniston 1970 has provided us with a magesterial work on the multiple possibilities of Attic prose and its supreme flexibility.

For instance, he looks at the different ways of introducing abstract expressions; the use of word order, for emphasis and rhythm; the structure of periods, whether strict or lax, or organised on the basis of antithesis or hendiadys, containing repetitions, anaphoras, *anacolutha* and asyndeton; augmenting or reducing the subordinates, which call for others, using genitive absolutes and predicative participles, etc. Short members dominate within the periods. The aim is always towards clarity of exposition and emphasis when the author deems necessary.

The concept of Attic, in connection to prose, is multiple, ranging from the elevated to the colloquial, the formally complex to the apparently casual, from the interminable periods of Isocrates to shorter ones. Because of this, the Latin orators could chose between Lysias and Demosthenes and the subsequent Atticists could follow different models. In any case, the loosely organised periods as well as the artificially constructed periods based on antithesis and assonance were discarded. Consequently, the well-organised but flexible period dominated by hypotaxis came into being, which was decisive for all subsequent literary languages, starting with Latin. Attic prose was directly or indirectly the model for all later prose.

225. Emphasis should be placed on the variants of Attic prose, within certain limits, and the existence of doublets, as in any language, which the constant presence of Ionians and other foreigners reinforced. This subject has been studied by A. López Eire in three works (1986b, 1991 and 1996a) on Aristophanes and one work on Thucydides (1984c). This is very appropriate, for Aristophanes was colloquial and Thucydides was a pioneer of prose; both precede the regularisation of written prose. Xenophon and the late Plato were both influenced by *koine*.

A. López Eire provides many examples of certain Aristophanic forms which would later belong to *koine*. For example, the plural next to the dual, the voc. Στρεψίαδες as though one were dealing with a stem in -s, diminutives tending to replace the base word (μειράκιον, which required the creation of the diminutive μειρακύλλιον), superlatives transformed into mere positives, the replacement of ναῦς, ἀρήν and ὄρνις by πλοῖον, ἀμνός and ὄρνεον, τις, τι as atenuant, etc. He also points out some coincidences in the syntax.

Similarly with Thucydides, as mentioned earlier: A. López Eire points out, among other things, the intense use of diminutives, the loss of the difference between ὅς and ὅστις, the use of prepositional phrases instead of cases, the confusion of εἰς and ἐν, the use of the active voice instead of the middle voice, the loss of the resultative value of the perfect, temporal periphrasis with εἶναι, the construction of ὅτι with the infinitive, etc. I think that these doublets remained in use in Attic, although, later, one of the

forms would prevail in prose, while the other would surface in *koine*. On the 'freedom' of Thucydides, see also R. Hiersche 1970, p. 215.

226. In effect, I believe that we are dealing with a somewhat artificial regularisation of Attic prose, beneath which strong forces were stirring which would end up creating *koine*. I will come back to this. Here, I would like to emphasise two important points: that at a certain point this regularity tended to be broken and that this began to be admitted:

(1) It is a well-known fact, after the work by L. Gautier 1911, that Xenophon is littered with non-Attic forms: not so many with respect to phonetics and morphology, but many in his vocabulary. They tend to be attributed to the agitated life of the writer, warring outside Athens and subsequently exiled, and consist of Doricisms and Ionicisms, as well as of various hesitations and, above all, a lexicon foreign to the standards of Attic prose.

His prose is often interpreted as containing Doricisms, Ionicisms and poeticisms, and some words have also been pointed out as being simply from *koine* (cf. for example, O. Hoffmann 1973). In fact, some of these words could also belong to the popular Attic base to which I have referred. This merits some research. In any case, it is clear that Xenophon anticipated *koine*, especially in his lexicon, whatever its origin.

(2) When writing my *Estudios sobre el léxico de las fábulas esópicas* (Adrados 1948) I was able to confirm time and again the existence of numerous lexical forms of *koine* in the last dialogues of Plato, in *Laws* and *Timaeus* in particular. This was used by A. Díaz Tejera 1961 for his study of Plato's chronology.

A writer who was active for almost fifty years could not help but reflect the linguistic changes of his period. So, we have first-rate documentation of the evolution of Attic vocabulary in the direction of *koine*, although we cannot discard the hypothesis that, very often, words from this infra-literary origin to which I have referred were gradually generalised and in the middle of the fourth century were eventually accepted into the literature.

4. The creation of the scientific language

The Presocratics

227. The Presocratics – who wrote in hexameters and in elegiac distics from the sixth century BC onwards (and in Ionic prose, from the same date) – were primarily responsible for laying the foundations for the creation of a scientific Greek language. The philosophical and technical writings of the Attic and Hellenistic periods would follow. Indeed, whereas other languages, from Latin to the modern European languages, created a scientific language that was essentially a continuation, adaptation and expansion of the Greek scientific language, Greek created a scientific language based on the common Greek language with all its bits and pieces. This distinguishes it from all the world's languages.

Yet this is true, not only with respect to the vocabulary, although this is perhaps the most fundamental aspect, but also with respect to the creation of a prose capable of linking ideas in a rational manner, and the creation of scientific texts organised in a systematic way. This was briefly discussed in §§ 197 ff.

This does not mean to say that the beginnings of a scientific language had not existed before or had not emerged in other places: for example, in Babylonia for astronomy, or in India for grammar. But in Greece, things proceeded in a more systematic way and, most importantly, a scientific language was created that would influence all of later languages. These langages, as I have stated in various works, are a species of semi-Greek or crypto-Greek, due to a series of Greek terms used with the form and sense of the originals or with others; or, indeed, used in translation through semantic calques. When we say *conciencia* in Spanish (Lat. *conscientia)* or *Gewissen* in German, we are in effect translating the Greek συνείδησις. The creation of this scientific language is inextricably linked to the creation of different philosophical and scientific systems.

In this chapter we will look at the origins of this language in the Ionic and Attic periods; it continued to develop in the Hellenistic period, in the Roman period and, subsequently, in the modern languages until the present day. Indeed, the Greeks constituted a monolingual world: thus, in creating their science, they had to express it in their own language, specialising and expanding it where necessary. Naturally, this did not occur all at once. The Presocratics and

Ionic-prose writers contributed only in the first phase, which was incomplete and hesitant, and which later grew enormously in Athens.

228. There is no global monographic study of the Greek scientific language or of its influence in the later scientific language: only partial studies of words, suffixes, etc. I refer the reader to Adrados 1997b, where I provide a general overview of this topic, along with the most important bibliography (my own works and those of others) on the characteristics of this language; and to Adrados 1996b, a summary of the role of Greek in this respect. Data is provided in Adrados–D. Lara (1998e) and Adrados–J. Rodríguez Somolinos 1995–96, on the treatment of this vocabulary in the *Diccionario Griego-Español.*

For the Presocratic origins of this vocabulary, cf. in particular Adrados 1995b, which is followed here, as well as R. Hiersche 1970, pp. 182, 184 ff., 190. On medical vocabulary, see § 232. For Heraclitus, cf. Adrados 1973a. Note that the new lexicon is not only derived from the new thought but is also better understood as a result of the new thought.

For the study of the development of the diferent suffixes, cf., in particular, P. Chantraine 1933 and 1956; there is a specialised bibliography for the various suffixes, based on E. Fränkel 1910–12.

A very complete bibliography of the lexicon of scientific Greek can be found in P. Boned Colera–J. Rodríguez Somolinos 1998.

229. It is evident that Greek literature and thought represent an authentic 'departure' in the direction of rationality and science; particularly, as mentioned previously, in the hands of the Presocratics, in verse or prose, and in Ionic prose. It was accompanied by the linguistic revolution discussed earlier. Yet, both thought and language were based on what had gone before: the poetic, particularly Homeric language, or conversational language. Terms, whether poetic or common, acquired a new meaning; others were also created by derivation or composition.

Characteristics of this language include, above all, new taxonomies and terminologies, new abstracts, and new lexical networks in which nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs correspond to each other. There are also other aspects of the language, mentioned previously: the creation of a scientific style and syntax and of a word composition which is also characteristic of scientific writing.

To return to the vocabulary, the procedures used, whether in isolation or in conjunction, are:

(a) The specialisation of the poetic and Ionic vocabulary.
(b) The creation of new terms for derivation or verbal composition; this includes the creation of abstracts from neutral

adjectives or adjectives with or without article: Anaximenes, τὸ δίκαιον; Anaxagoras, τὸ θερμόν; Democritus, τὰ καλά, τὸ δέον.

(c) The creation of systems of opposition, whether formalised (containing one of the two paired terms with ἀ-, δυσ-, αὐτο-, etc.), or not (the type εἰμί/γίγνομαι, γένεσις/φθορά, βίος/θάνατος); this involves the existence of synonyms or semi-synonyms in each term, as I have studied in Heraclitus (πῦρ -ἕν, ἀξύνετοι -ἀπείρονες -εὕδοντες, λόγος-, μέτρον-δίκη).

(d) The creation of networks of noun/adjective/verb/adverb, as stated earlier.

Of course, the Presocratics advanced relatively little; there is a dominance of abstracts in -ίη over the later ones in -μα·, adjectives in -ικός (characteristic of the Sophists) are rare, their opposites and their lexical networks were later sometimes continued and expanded (or not, as the case may be). In addition, there are deficiencies and discrepancies among certain authors.

230. As has been pointed out, there is a tendency to use poetic language as a starting point, from which changes in meaning are made or parallel forms are created. So, for instance, ἀνώνυμος, *Od.* VIII 552, and ἀνόητος, *H. Merc.* 80, were given a philosophical meaning in Parm. 8, 17 and 16; ἀνώλεθρος (Anaximand. 3) was created on this base. Φιλότης and Νεῖκος, 'love' and 'hate' in Homer, were transformed into cosmic principles in Empedocles; and κόσμος 'frame' in *Od.* VIII 492 became 'world'.

This continued in Hippocrates, where, for example ἰχώρ, the Homeric 'blood of the gods', was changed into 'serum'.

Concretely, the cosmogonies and theogonies were a source of inspiration for the creation of the new vocabulary: this is not surprising, since the investigation of the ἀρχή or 'beginning' of the world was but a rational continuation of the cosmogonies and theogenies.

In effect, the 'beginnings' of the Presocratics were in Homer the names of the corresponding elements used in the comogonies ('water', etc.). Presocratic uses such as the ἀπείρονα γῆς βάθη of Emp. 39, sprang from Homeric and Hesiodic uses, in cosmogonic passages (*Il.* XIV 200 and 301 πείρατα γαίης, among others) and from πέρας, ἄπειρος, ἀπείρων which indicate a lack of limits; the substantivisation of ἄπειρον 'the indefinite' in Pythagoras and Anaximander was an advance.

In the Homeric passage cited we also find γένεσις: *Il.* XIV 201 Ὠκεανόν τε, θεῶν γένεσιν is no doubt the source of the use of this term in Parmenides, Aristophanes and Plato to indicate the 'origin' of the gods; and from Homer we obtain the later uses of φύσις 'nature': in Homer the word only referred to the magical quality of a plant, cf. Od. X 303 and P. Chantraine 1933, p. 238. There is a precedent in Pherecydes of Syros, 3, with regard to τὰ ἐναντία 'the contraries'.

231. More clarity is needed with regard to the Presocratics, who inspired the creation of lexical systems and meanings which were often maintained.

We should consider those that we rather anachronistically call abstractions, such as the series of semi-divine principles: earth (Γῆ), love (Ἔρως), etc. Also, principles such as ἄπειρον or λόγος which function on their own, are automatically included. These terms were in the vanguard of the rich world of abstraction of later philosophies.

Another important point for the first thinkers was the unity of Nature, Man and God. Certainly, Greek philosophy and science attempted to break this unity, but traces of it remained in ancient time, and are reflected in the vocabulary. Terms related to the sphere of human life passed into the sphere of nature: for instance, δίκη, λόγος, μέτρον, νόμος, used now to refer to cosmic law or regularity. Inversely, a natural or physical term such as κόσμος entered the human sphere.

It should be pointed out that the scientific vocabulary of the Presocratics was achronical. Its principles, or ἀρχαί, refer to atemporal realities: τὰ ἐναντία 'the contraries', τὰ ὄντα 'being', τὸ θερμόν 'heat', etc. In Heraclitus, λόγος refers to both a structural, organisational law of the universe and a law of evolution.

Another point worth considering is that in the Presocratics certain words were still mid-way (depending on the passages) between a mythico-religious and a philosophical conception. The word 'ανάγκη refers to necessity, experienced as a religious force, but also to natural law (Hdt. II 22) and physical or logical necessity (Parm. B 8, 30; 10, 6; Emp. B 15, 1). The word νόμος means divine law (Heraclit. B 114), but also (in the same text) the law of the city.

On the other hand, the lexical networks discussed (oppositions, correspondences between different classes of words) could be incomplete in the Presocratics: only Plato, Aristotle and the Hellenistic philosophers completed them.

Yet there is a serious problem: sometimes, uses which are absent in the B fragments (the literal ones) appear in the A fragments, which are mainly citations in the source language but could also often be faithful transmitters of the original text. For example, the philosophical use of διαρέω, διαίρεσις ('to distinguish', 'distinction') appears in Plato and Aristotle, but had also appeared earlier in the A fragments of Leucippus, Parmenides, Empedocles, Archytas, etc. Therefore, certain doubts exist regarding the history of the scientific vocabulary.

232. Thus, the new vocabulary offers various possibilities:

(a) Sometimes it only represents a semantic specialization of the old meaning: αἰών 'eternity', αἰσθάνομαι 'to perceive with the senses', γίγνομαι 'to evolve', τὰ ὄντα 'being', φύσις 'nature', etc. I have already mentioned Φιλότης and Νεῖκος, δίκη, νοῦς, νόμος, etc.

(b) New terms are created, as expected: frequently, they are derived forms (with prefixes or suffixes) or substantivisations. For instance, ἄπειρον 'the infinite', the principle of Anaximander; cf. more details in Adrados 1995b, p. 15. Or, new words such as αἴσθησις (Anaxag. B 2, Democr. B 9), in addition to those already cited, δίζησις (Parm. B 1, 32; 4, 2), νόημα (Xenoph. B 23, 2; Parm. B 16, 4; Emp. B 105, 3; etc.). Sometimes, as mentioned previously, doubts exist regarding the date of new formations such as διαίρεσις

Occasionally, both the adjective and noun make their appearance in the Presocratics for the first time: for example, ἄτομος 'indivisible', ἄτομον 'the indivisible'.

(c) Irregularities survive, as expected; some related to different uses by the different authors, others related to different systems. For example, Anaxagoras opposes νοῦς to ὕλη, Xenophanes opposes δέμας to νόημα (and likens νοῦς to φρήν), the new and multiple oppositions of Heraclitus are well documented, as well as Parmenides' comparison of φρονεῖν and εἶναι.

The Presocratics ushered in the start of the Greek philosophical lexicon, which, on the one hand, would become simplified, and on the other hand, would become specialised and would proliferate. Its roots can be found in the poetic and in the Ionic language. The number of substantivisations of the neuter adjective (with or without article)

would increase, as would the abstracts created by means of a familiar series of suffixes. Among them, -ίη, -μα, -σις, Homeric and Ionic suffixes, establish their presence in the new terminology, and -μός is preferred by the physicians. The diffusion of adjectives derived from nouns is still relatively small.

The Hippocratics

233. In Herodotus and Hippocrates we come across the same tendencies which advance the cultural lexicon of Greek, particularly the scientific lexicon. But it is the work of the latter author in particular that we should study; that is, the Hippocratic treatises considered to be older. The discussion by R. Hiersche 1970, p. 190 is useful, along with works specially focused on Hippocrates, such as those by G. Maloney 1980, P. Fabrini and A. Lanni 1979, J. Irigoin 1980 and 1983, D. Lanza 1983, J. Zaragoza–A. González Senmartí 1989, C. Despotopoulos 1986, G. Santana 1991, A. López Eire 1992. Other works regarding medical lexicon in general are also importantant, such as those of N. van Brock 1961 and F. Skoda 1988.

For the composition of the treatises, the best work is by D. Lara 1984. The book by van Groningen 1958, p. 247 ff. and the article by A. Bernabé are also useful.

234. The Hippocratics, starting with the first ones, created a specialised medical lexicon. The lexicon developed with the specialisation of Homeric words, and of common Ionic or Attic ones: we have seen that these authors used these dialects simultaneously. Thus, in the first Hippocratic treatises, πάθη, πάθημα, or πάθος refer to 'conditions': the first two words are Ionic and appear in Herodotus, but with the double meaning of 'condition' and 'suffering' (in Aristoteles, παθήματα is later 'passions'); the third word is Attic. So, there are various sources and a specialised treatment; as when, for instance, epic and Ionic νοῦσος coexist with the new forms νοσηρός and νόσημα, created on the Attic base νόσος.

There is an interesting study by Nadia van Brock 1961 about the specialisation of medical terms from the Homeric lexicon, preferring ἰητρός rather than ἰητήρ, for example, giving θεραπεύω specialised uses, etc.

The medical language is the first specialised scientific language, although it naturally followed existing paths and operated within tendencies which were in turn followed by the rest of the scientific languages later created: there was no interruption in medicine or in any of the other fields. It is worth noting the study by F. Skoda

1988 on how metaphor was used in a conscious way to create a new medical and anatomical lexicon.

235. In parallel, medicine was the first science to create its own literary instrument: the scientific treatise. Its precedents can be found in the composition of didactic poetry, which I have studied in Hesiod (cf. Adrados 1986c): a prologue which looks forward to the content is followed by parts that more or less respond to it, but with notable incoherences and digressions, although unified by the continuity provided by the 'echo' of key words. The presence of maxims is important.

This prologue somewhat followed the model provided by Parmenides and, as far as we know, Heraclitus, whose prologue is known to us but was no doubt disfigured through the manner in which he is cited: we are nearly always provided merely with isolated maxims. In the literary composition of these authors, A. Bernabé 1979 sees a great influence of epic and poetic models and, above all, of gnomic literature; although I believe that this latter aspect has been exaggerated by our transmitters.

So, the first Hippocratic treatises, followed later by the others, offer schemes which, although still imperfect, are much closer to the later scientific treatises. They contain a prologue, a nucleus, and an epilogue, which are all somewhat differenciated. There are procedures in place to distinguish them.

The prologue anticipates and, occasionally, indicates the organisation of the nucleus into various parts; the epilogue summarises and provides advice. The nucleus or its parts begin with clear expositions, which at times become unthreaded and are centered on details or examples. There were clear procedures for articulating all of this through formulas for opening and closing, and ring composition (cf. the reference in § 203 to the book by O. Wenskuns 1982); and sometimes it is simply the content that establishes the divisions.

All of this influenced the τέχναι or diverse 'arts' of the fifth century, in sofar as they are attested today; in turn, these could also exert some influence. The treatises of the Hellenistic and Roman periods were also influenced, as I mentioned earlier.

It is not surprising that we should encounter problems here regarding composition. After all, literary units are linguistic units, which are the most subjective and adaptable. The new models made their first appearance in Ionic and later in Attic, and they would have a

great success in the later literatures. A scientific lexicon, a coherent syntax with long periods and literary composition go hand in hand in the creation of the new educated language – particularly in philosophy and science, which would serve as the model for all the later ones.

Attic literature

236. The same tendencies were carried over into Attic literature – philosophy, primarily, but certainly not exclusively. As mentioned previously, even Socrates, who by definition used the colloquial language, created specialised words such as φρόνησις (the Socratic virtue par excellence), ἐπιμέλομαι 'to take care of', ἐξετάζω 'to examine', ἐλέγχω 'to test', φροντίζω 'to think', etc., in order to express new concepts. The development of a specialised lexicon in Plato is well documented. I have looked at the subject in various articles, such as Adrados 1971 and 1992a. There are two distinct phases.

In the first phase, the common lexicon acquires a new meaning. When Socrates (or Plato) attempt to define the meaning of certain words in the Socratic dialogues, they provide them with a new meaning, eliminating, at the very least, some conventional aspects of these words. For instance, the following terms were moralised and practically made synonymous: ἀγαθός, καλός and δίκαιος; a generic meaning of desire or search was created for ἔρως; new meanings were created for εἶδος, ἰδέα or κίνησις or, in Aristotle, for κατηγορία or ὄργανον. Words and meanings that have been transmitted to all of the languages of the world.

The second phase constitutes the creation of new terms, such as, in Aristotle, ἐθικός, ἐντελέχεια or κίνημα, which have had substantial success. When in Spanish we speak of *órgano, entelequia, categoria, especie* (and its derivatives) we are still speaking in Aristotelian terms.

At times, these authors have completed lexical networks, although, as we have seen, there is sometimes doubt as to whether Plato is the creator or whether the A fragments of the Presocratics reflect a new kind of use. In any case, oppositions such as ψυχή/σῶμα, ζωή/θάνατος, ὕλη/νοῦς, γιγνώσκω/αἰσθάνομαι, ἐπιστήμη/τέχνη, ἐμπειρία, which still dominate thought and the common lexicon (sp. *alma/cuerpo, vida/muerte, materia/espíritu, conocer/percibir, ciencia/arte, empiría*) were only consolidated from this date onwards, although there were earlier precedents.

This study of the development of the Attic lexicon is not complete. But we can obtain much information from the progress of the different suffixes: on the one hand, from those that create abstract words (alongside the other system, which consists in the abstract use of neuter adjectives, with or without an article); on the other hand, from those suffixes that derive adjectives from nouns, adverbs from adjectives (frequently, we are dealing with ancient plural neuters or forms in -ως), verbs from nouns and nouns from verbs, creating the lexical networks to which I have referred which enable a free construction of the phrase. Sometimes, different suffixes introduce the possibility of different groups of meaning in the noun and in the verb.

It should be noted that it was not just the philosophers (who expanded the lexicon of the Ionic philosophers), but also Attic prose in general which diffused these models, although they would finally end up being used by the Sophists and, later, the philosophers. The Hellenistic language would follow the same path.

237. It is curious to study (in P. Chantraine 1933, for example) the development – in Ionic and later in Attic, especially among the philosophers – of the different suffixes of abstract nouns or nouns of action in -ία, -σις, -ος, -μα, -σύνη, -τητ-, etc. Sometimes these suffixes have values which are practically synonymous (πάθημα and πάθος, ἀπολόγημα and ἀπολογία); sometimes they offer clear oppositions (δίδαγμα and δίδαξις, ποίημα and ποίησις; result and action). The poets preferred -σύνη, the philosophers -τητ-, and the physicians -σις to designate diseases or their symptoms.

The most developed suffix – adjectival, naturally, although it could of course be substantivised/nominalised – was -ικός, followed by -ιακός, -τικός, -ιστικός: a suffix that was hardly used by Homer but was very popular among the young disciples of the Sophists; see the well-known passage by Aristophanes, *Knights* 1371–81, where he introduces a classification, a 'belonging to' list, as it were; it formed the basis for the systems, still surviving today, of -ος/-ικός, -ισμής/-ιστής/-ιστικός

The use of the suffix grew enormously in Herodotus and Thucydides (ἀγὼν γυμνικός, μουσικός/βαρβαρικός/Ἑλληνικός); in Plato it appears no less than 390 times. It is worth noting the use of substantivisation in -ική to name sciences and techniques, as well as the use of adjectives derived from adjectives (ἐλεύθερος/ἐλευθέριος/ἐλευθερικός).

The suffix was destined for great success: in the *Reverse Index* of C. D. Buck and W. Petersen there are 4,627 examples (and 156 examples of -ιακός). I will discuss its diffusion in Latin further on. Today, it dominates in all languages.

Example of a lexical system

238. Perhaps the clearest way of illustrating the development of the intellectual vocabulary of Greek – from Homer to the Presocratics and Ionic, from the latter to Attic and, subsequently, Plato and Aristotle, to arrive at late Hellenistic Greek – is by resorting to the example of a root's derivatives. Here, I shall provide a brief description of the development of the derivatives of the root of νόος, νοέω.

Only five forms appear in Homer: the verbs νοέω and προνοέω, the nouns νόος and νόημα, and the adjective ἄνοος. We should also add ἀνόητος in *H. Merc.* and ἄνοια in lyric. From here, there is a superb development in two paths that complement each other:

(a) With the help of various prefixes, the main ones being ἀ-, ἀμφι-, ἀνα-, ἀπο-, δια-, δυσ-, ἐκ-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, ὑπερ-, ὑπο.
(b) With the help of derivative elements which tend to form a network in which various nouns correspond to various verbs and adjectives, and to these, various adverbs.

Aside from these forms (in -ως or adverbial neuters, or in -εί), we have the case in which the verb νόεω corresponds to the nouns νόος, νόημα and νοήσις (these are simple, the derivatives of the former are adjectives); νοητής, simple or compound; only compounds -νοησία, -νοια. With regard to the adjectives, there are νόος compound forms (ἄνους, etc.), from νόημα we obtain νοήμων; and the following are also related (with the verb too): νοητός (and ἀνόητος, etc.) and νοερός; from the first we obtain νοητικός, and from νόημα, νοηματικός. With regard to the verbs, in addition to νοέω (and its compounds), there is ἀνοηταίνω and ἀνοητέω.

This network is irregular and not absolutely symmetrical with all the preverbs; it gradually reached its completion after the Homeric and lyric periods. Some forms were in turn abandoned, such as ἀνοήμων (only in Democritus). There were various types of development. The scheme is as follows:

(1) Hom., the lyric poets and all prose: cases previously cited from Homer, *H. Merc.* and lyr. (ἀνόητος and ἄνοια).
(2) Presocr., Pl and Arist.; for example νοερός and νοητός.
(3) Ionic prose, Attic, Pl and Arist.: διάνοια, διανόημα, διανόησις, παράνοια, πρόνοια; ἐννοέω, ἐπινοέω; κατανοέω, ὑπονοέω.
(4) Attic, sometimes in Gorg. and Antiph., in addition to P. and Arist.: ἔννοια, ἐπίνοια, δύσνοια, ὑπόνοια; δύσνοος (not in Arist.).
(5) Diog. Apol., Pl, Arist.: νόησις; διανοέω.
(6) Pl, Arist.: ἐννόησις, κατανόημα (*Epin.*), κατανόησις, περίνοια (*Ax.*); διανοητικός; παρανοέω, ἀνοηταίνω.
(7) Arist.: ἔκνοια, ἐννοόημα, νοητικός, διανοητός.

The great volume of Hellenistic and late vocabulary, or only late, should be added: for example, adjectives in -νους are Hellenistic or late: ἔκνους, ἀμφίνους, περίνους; as well as many adjectives in -νοήμων, -νοητικός and -νοηματικός; nouns in -νόησις, -νοητής; the verbs ἀνοητεύω, ἀνοητέω; etc.

Thus, this complex lexicon was gradually created, introducing classifications in the noun (abstract, action, and agent nouns) and other corresponding classifications in the adjective, subordinating all of this to the other classification introduced for the preverbs. The successive periods of the Presocratics, of Ionic and Attic prose, and the different philosophies are clearly displayed.

Conclusion

239. So, Ionic-Attic clearly created a prose capable of expressing everything related to thought, its process and organisation, with the help of a specialised vocabulary and a syntax in which hypotaxis dominates. The most important thing to remember is that we are dealing with an open, flexible language, capable of increasing or modifying its lexicon and syntax to the needs of the whole intellectual and scientific universe. Indeed, it achieves this without rigidity, which makes it possible for the common man to follow all of sorts of specialisations and lines of thought, with extremely broad nuances and possibilities.

PART TWO

FROM KOINE TO THE PRESENT

CHAPTER ONE

KOINE AND ITS RELATION TO OTHER LANGUAGES

1. Origin, definition and levels

240. Attic prose at some point joined the ranks of the literary languages that belonged to a literary genre, which is exactly what was occurring in the other literary languages of Greece descended from the Homeric language. This literary language was not identical to spoken Attic. Attic was used in inscriptions to the same extent as the other spoken dialects, also, like Syracusan, for the dialogue of comedy and, of course, for the dialogue of Socrates and his interlocutors in the streets and plazas of Athens.

But here we come across something that is new and original: it was not just literary Attic that was diffused across the entire Greek world as almost the unique language of prose (Ionic and Doric prose, exceptionally, continued to exist for a time), but also spoken Attic, which was diffused throughout Alexander's empire, to begin with, and later beyond it. In some cases, the Attic was, of course, rather modified and was somewhat split up into variants.

This Attic is customarily called *koine*, Common Greek. The term is ambiguous: here it is used to refer to Common Greek as a whole, with its popular or conversational (sometimes vulgar) and literary variants. From the beginning, reciprocal influences and relations were established between these variants: the first filtered or avoided certain features of the second, which rejected features of the popular variant but was subjected to its influence. Both underwent fragmentation or evolution: we shall consider them separately.

Of course, both variants have many elements in common, although neither is unitary. Conversational or popular *koine* was always a somewhat Ionicised Attic, rather exempt from the regularisations of prose; and rather submitted to a process of morphological simplification and phonetic and syntactic, as well as lexical, evolution. Literary *koine* approaches it but it is more influenced by Attic prose, and this literary influence grew with time. Here we definitely find the roots, as established long ago by N. Hatzidakis and K. Krumbacher, of

the two modern Greek languages, the *dimotikí* or 'popular' language and the *katharévusa* or 'pure' language, to which I have already referred.

241. This diffusion of a written but also spoken language, which unified vast areas formerly occupied by various dialects, is something new, although the groundwork was prepared, as mentioned previously, by the earlier literary languages, especially Ionic (whose diffusion had been, in turn, prepared by the common or literary languages of poetry).

This process of universal diffusion can be explained by historical circumstances, starting with the creation of the Athenian Maritime League in 477 BC (and the second League in 377 BC). The kingdom of Macedonia, the empire of Alexander, the kingdoms of the Diadochi, the Aetolian and Achaean Leagues, together with other alliances or hegemonies, required common languages. The main language, naturally, was the Ionic-Attic *koine* that we have been discussing, but it was not the only language. There were various Doric *koinai*, more or less established: that of the east of the Aegean (with a centre in Rhodes), that of the Greek of the N.W., that of the Doric of the Achaean League, the Syracusan which for a period dominated in Sicily (from the start of the fourth century BC until it was gradually displaced by the Ionic-Attic *koine* and subsequently by Latin, cf. C. Cosani 1993, p. 118 ff.).

But all the *koinai* and all of the Greek dialects ended up being displaced by the Ionic-Attic *koine* after a period of diglossia. *Koine* also had to struggle with different non-Greek languages (Egyptian, Aramaic, Lycian, Latin, etc.), admitting elements of theirs, providing them with borrowings, or making them disappear.

242. As we can see, the history of *koine* is rather complicated. One has to distinguish the origin of *koine* from its later diffusion. Let us start with the former topic.

It has been said that both literary Attic (from around the end of the fifth century into the fourth century and then converted into literary *koine*) and popular or spoken *koine* are descendants of the Maritime League or, if preferred, the Athenian empire.

I have already looked at the creation of liteary Attic: the Athenians and foreigners who lived in Athens, precisely through the initiative of some of the latter, stopped writing in Ionic at some point and began writing in Attic (although there are exceptions). The political and intellectual power of Athens led to the conversion of its lan-

guage into a literary language. The same occurred in the case of Castilian, Florentine, and the French of the Ile de France.

The creation of popular, spoken *koine* is more complex, besides which there are discrepancies in the interpretation of the facts. But we can be certain of one thing: Attic and Ionic had already begun approximating each other in the fifth century. This is not surprising, given the power, political and otherwise, which Athens had over the Ionians of the Maritime League, both those of the islands and the continent, and the constant Ionic presence in Athens.

War, politics, commerce, the tribunals, everything worked to approximate them. It was a process that culminated in the adoption by Athens of an Ionic alphabet in the year 403 (and it was not long before its use became generalised in all parts).

It should be noted that since Antiquity, diverse circumstances of human and commercial mobility had acclimatised all kinds of Greek speech in Athens. This is stated by both Solon (24, 31 f.) and Pseudo Xenophon (II 8).

243. I have already looked at the influence of Ionic in fifth-century Attic literature. Ionic forms are also found in Attic inscriptions from 450 onwards: the lengthened D. pl., σύν, etc. Although sometimes we are really dealing with Attic archaisms, or with the 'subterranean' Attic which I discussed.

The penetration of Attic in Ionia after the same period is more decisive, creating the so-called Great Attic (*Gran Atico, Grossattisch*), the predecessor of *koine*.

We have seen it in Herodotus and Hippocrates. It is present in inscriptions from the fifth century onwards, cf. A. López Eire 1996b: οἰκίαν, ὄντας, ἐκγόνοις, etc. Indeed, certain Hellenistic forms such as ναός 'temple' appeared in the 'Great Attic' of the islands much earlier than in Athens (in the fourth century in Delos, *circa* 250 in Athens).

This 'Great Attic' is, as stated, an anticipation of *koine*, which is fundamentally Attic, with -ρα, -ια, -οις, -αις, etc., but with certain Ionic forms and other general or Doric forms (-σσ-, -ρρ-, etc.). It also contains Attic variants such as can be found in Aristophanes and Xenophon, and some of the vulgar Attic as studied by P. Kretschmer 1894, Wahrmann 1907, and E. Nachmanson 1910; and, above all, it contains a large dose of lexicon that is poetic, Ionic, and, very often, no doubt 'subterranean' Attic. Apart from the authors previously cited (Xenophon, the late Plato), Aristotle and the Hellenistic authors were also invaded by it.

So, *koine* is fundamentally Attic, although it contains Ionic elements and vocabulary (for example, the declension in -άς/-ᾶδος) and has eliminated Atticisms such as -ττ-, -ρρ- and certain inflectional types. It displays κόρη, ξένος, ὅλος, etc.

244. However, authors such as V. Bubeník 1989 and A. López Eire 1993a insist that the participation of vulgar Attic in *koine* was rare (not accepting forms such as παῦς) and that the diffusion of the middle-class, administrative and bureaucratic Attic of the inscriptions was significant. They stress the similarity between the language of Attic and Macedonian public inscriptions, in the period after Phillip II, the father of Alexander. This Attic, in effect, would have been accepted by the Macedonian court and, subsequently, by the courts of the Diadochi. The influence of the Attic of the Macedonians in the expansion of Greek in Asia, particularly through the foundation of cities, has recently been greatly emphasised.

To be sure, the Attic of the Macedonian inscriptions and of the official inscriptions of the Hellenistic period is the 'Great Attic' which has been discussed, in its official or literary version (later reinforced by the role of the Athenian school and the Attic literature which was read inside and outside Athens). But this is just one aspect of the problem. The other means of diffusion was through the popular 'Great Attic', which was diffused in Ionia during fifth and fourth centuries, and through that of the soldiers and colonists, Macedonians or otherwise, who arrived in Asia. This view is held by C. Brixhe 1993b. Indeed, the continuity of morphological and lexical Attic 'variants' in *koine* as a whole, as discussed previously, and even of vulgar forms, points in the same direction.

So, in the same way that there is a popular Attic (colloquial or vulgar) and a literary Attic, so there is also a popular, conversational *koine* and a literary *koine*. Neither is unitary, and I will elaborate on this further on; they share many common elements and exchange many elements. This situation did not change until modern Greece.

245. We have greater knowledge of literary *koine*: not just through the inscriptions, but, above all, through prose literature (at this time, poetry was written in the ancient dialects that had been resuscitated for this purpose), although we shall see that in the literary *koine*, there would be a shift from Atticism to poetism and that, for the oldest ones, our documentation is very scarce. Apart from the inscriptions, for the vulgar register we mainly have the Cynics and separate fea-

tures adopted by various authors; for the middle register, after Aristotle, Menander, Epicurus, we have fragments of various philosophers, Philo of Byzantium, Aristeas, Polybius, certain parts of the LXX, some papyri, some apocryphal texts such as the *Definitions*, attibuted to Plato, or the *De decentia*, attributed to Hippocrates (cf. U. Fleischer 1939), and a few more.

With regard to popular, spoken *koine*, we have to make do with the 'mistakes' of written texts, all of those mentioned above and others such as private papyri, the LXX (literature of translation; but some books correspond to a higher level) and the New Testament (these two texts have special features); the *Life of Aesop* and cynic texts such as the fragments of Bion of Borysthenes may also be included. Note that a written text, however 'popular', always aspires to propriety, to the literary. Also, literary texts, as we have seen, contain 'mistakes' of spoken *koine*. In any case, there is a great correspondence between both *koinai*, however much literature may partially correct the morphology, syntax, and lexicon; and it almost entirely covers phonetic evolution.

A valid description can be provided for both *koinai*. But it is only partial: for example, the disappearance of the D. and the construction ἐν + D. can rarely be followed in the literary texts, which introduce the dual, optative, and so many other forms which had been lost. For more details, see §§ 261 ff., 275 ff.

I must stress the existence of two *koinai*, interrelated and divided into different levels; I will discuss their local and temporal differences in §§ 254 ff., 259 ff.

246. For *koine* in general see, among others: K. Dieterich 1898, A. Thumb 1974, A. Meillet 1975, p. 253 ff., L. R. Palmer 1980, p. 174 ff., V. Bubeník 1989, p. 180 ff., R. Browning 1993, p. 19 ff., Cl. Brixhe 1993b, A. López Eire 1993, p. 41 ff., J. Niejoff-Panagiotidids 1994, p. 195 ff., G. Horrocks 1997, p. 32 ff. On the role of Macedonia in the origins of *koine*, see Cl. Brixhe–A. Panayotis 1988, A. Panayotis 1992 and G. Horrocks 1997, p. 42 ff. For the levels of *koine* in written texts, see F. R. Adrados 1948 and 1981b. For vulgar Greek, see K. Dieterich 1898, P. Wahrmann 1909, E. Nachmanson 1910 and H. Ljungvik 1932. For the Doric *koinai*, V. Bubeník 1989, p. 227 ff., G. Vottéro 1996, C. Consani 1996, M. Bile 1996, etc.

It should be pointed out that the theory followed here is that which is commonly accepted, although, as I mentioned earlier, there are discrepancies with regard to the role of the popular Attic language. It goes against the idea of *koine* as a mixture of dialects, as held by P. Kretschmer 1901, cf. A. Thumb and others; for *koine* as a 'pidgin' or 'creole', cf. J. Frösén 1974 (and the critique in V. Bubeník 1989, p. 180 ff.).

2. The diffusion of koine

The diffusion

247. The triumph of Attic is quite remarkable. It became the general language of all the Greeks after the two great defeats of Athens: that of 404 against Sparta and 338 (and 322) against Macedonia. Indeed, Castilian and French, for example, became general languages of more extensive nations, not only due to their literary significance, but also due to the political power of Castilla and the Ile de France: both factors went hand in hand. But not here: one would have to compare the diffusion of the Florentine dialect in Italy and the language of Luther in Germany, and even then it does not bear comparison.

To be more exact, in the fifth century Attic began to convert, in a slightly modified way, into a lingua franca of the Athenian empire: political power and trade account for this because, literarily speaking, Athens continued to be a province of Ionia. Later, Attic imposed itself as a literary language.

When the political power of Athens was eclipsed, the foundations laid in the fifth century – that is, Attic as a lingua franca outside of Athens and the literary Attic which even non-Athenians were beginning to write – were maintained. Linguistically speaking, the victory of the Spartans and their allies was meaningless. Throughout the fourth century their dialects were implacably invaded by Attic, and this also applied to the Doric *koinai* which attempted to resist. Indeed, nearly all the intellectual life of Greece, which expressed itself in Attic and later *koine*, converged on Athens, the free city.

A second factor was decisive: the adaptation of Attic (Great Attic) by the court of Macedonia in the fifth century. Great Attic was accepted by enemies as well as friends. Consequently, the military defeat against Macedonia constituted a linguistic victory for Athens: it accelerated a process which had already begun. Athens, having attempted to establish its hegemony in Greece in the fifth century, failed in this attempt despite its intitial success. But failure in the political field translated into success in the linguistic field. Here, Athens was the great victor. This is the paradox, which I think has no parallels in linguistic history.

The triumph of Attic was merely one aspect of the intellectual triumph of Athens, which conditioned all of literature and later thought (although pre-Attic literature, written in the diverse literary languages

which converged in Ionic, also strongly influenced later literature). For the educated Hellenistic public, all of this meant a reinforcement of unity: the Greek tradition, which they were attempting to continue.

248. Let us study the diffusion of *koine* more closely. Various points can be noted:

(1) The gradual conversion of Attic and Great Attic into *koine*: in Attica, in the Ionian cities of the islands, Asia Minor, and Macedonia.
(2) The conversion of the Ionic of exportation into *koine*: for example, in Caria and Lycia, where it was cultivated, at least as a written language, from the fifth century onwards; and in the colonies of Italy, Sicily, and the West. See Part I of this volume on the colonies of Gaul and Hispania; the Greek alphabet was used to write the Celtic and Iberian languages.
(3) The direct implantation of Great Attic and *koine* in non-Greek territories by means of the Macedonian conquest and the politics of the Diadochi. Macedonians and Greeks of various origins were established in recently founded cities, in which they essentially survived isolated from the easterners; where as children they attended schools in which they studied Greek letters and literature; although this did not, however, prevent the reciprocal influence of the languages, see §§ 254 ff., 286 ff. In spite of the Lesbian which continued to be spoken and written in Lesbos, *koine* was spoken in Pergamum from the beginning, and in all of the Macedonian settlements.
(4) The penetration of different dialects (Aeolic, Boeotian, Doric, etc.) by *koine*, which supposes a gradual period of bilingualism, a '*koinisation*' of the dialects and a gradual loss of their active dominion, although they would be partly preserved and would continue to be written in certain circumstances. This is discussed in more detail below. In a remote corner of the Greek world, in Pamphylia, local characteristics of *koine* penetrated into the local dialect, whereas in other parts, under more conservative influence, it took much longer for these local characteristics to impose themselves.

(5) The expansion of *koine* outside the strict dominions of the Greek world. For instance, in Rome, partly due to the effect of a Greek-speaking immigrant population (including Syrians, Jews, etc.), and partly to the fact that it was the second language of educated Romans. In this way, the Greek language began to influence the Latin language, and, similarly, Greek literature began to influence Latin literature. This compensated for the fact that Greek had been displaced in the West by Latin.

249. The cultural and universal value of the Greek language resulted in documents being written in this language by kings and dignitaries who spoke other languages: King Ashoka (third century BC) translated into Greek the edicts that he placed in what is today Afghanistan; edicts or important documents were written in Greek by the kings of the kingdom of Axum in Ethiopia during and after the Hellenistic period (cf. E. Bernand and others 1991), by the Sasanid King Sapor (third century BC), as well as, much later, the khans of Bulgaria (eighth and ninth centuries AD).

The same is true of literature: Romans such as Fabius Pictor wrote in Greek, as well as jews such as Flavius Josephus, Chaldians such as Berosos, Egyptians such as Manetho (not to mention those of a later date). Greek became the language of the Christian Church in the East and the official language of Byzantium from the Danube to the Euphrates and the Nile, and also of its conquests in the West.

On the other hand, there is the exportation of the Greek alphabet and its essential role in the creation of different alphabets (continuing an already ancient process). Also, the diffusion of linguistic characteristics and literary and cultural models to all the surrounding world. In this way, a small conglomerate of dialects which occupied a reduced geographical area, that of Greece, was converted into a universal language, a model for all the others. Indeed, Greek continued to be spoken in Greece (although in a geographical area equally reduced), as well as in an important diaspora, until today. Thus, Greek originated in Greece and eventually found refuge again in Greece, but it made a permanent impact on all languages.

But this is another topic, which we will come back to later. The fact is that Greek, in its *koine* phase, whether colloquial or literary, gradually extended throughout the Mediterranean world and beyond. From Cordoba to Kandahar, from Meroe to Bulgaria.

The 'koinisation' of the dialects

250. Let us now turn to the subject of the 'koinisation' of the Greek dialects. It is widely known that the modern Greek dialects do not come from the ancient dialects, with the exception of Tsakonian in Messenia and Pontic in particular; there are doubts about the Greek of Calabria, which is rather more Byzantine, cf. D. Minniti-Gonia 1992. In general, Modern Greek derives from *koine*, which absorbed all of the Greek dialects.

This subject has been studied in much detail by a number of scholars: after A. Thumb 1901, p. 282, by A. López Eire, V. Bubeník, G. Horrocks, and the French school of C. Brixhe, M. Bile and R. Hodot, among others, always on the basis of inscriptions which allow us to make out the influence of spoken *koine* in the local dialects.

There is variation from dialect to dialect. Dialectal inscriptions often stop around the beginning of our era, but dialectal inscriptions or dialectal features in *koine* inscriptions sometimes survive up to the third century AD. In the long run, the resistance of the Doric *koinai* mentioned above proved useless, as did some conservative dialects such as those of Boeotia, Messenia and Cyrenaica, in addition to artificial resurrections, for political reasons, in Lesbos, Laconia, Elis and Cyprus.

The public and private inscriptions of the local dialects, which are more conservative, are a different case altogether. In the former, certain cases have been studied in which political reasons motivated the preservation of the local dialect, for example, in Larissa (cf. L. R. Palmer 1980, p. 189 ff.), Boeotia (cf. G. Vottéro 1996, p. 56 ff., G. Horrocks 1997, p. 37 ff.), Lesbos and Cyprus (cf. R. Hodot 1990c). *Koine* was preferred in foreign relations or for various political uses, whereas the dialect was used within the territory for various purposes and particularly to highlight nationalist attitudes. Yet the dialect eventually would be penetrated by *koine* and would even contain hypercorrections which reflect just how unfamiliar it was to its speakers.

251. After A. Thumb, a very informative general perspective, from dialect to dialect, can be found in V. Bubenic 1989, p. 73 ff., cf. also P. Wahrman 1907, J. Niehoff-Panagiotidids 1994, p. 273 ff. and G. Horrocks 1997. A very good up-to-date study is provided by A. López Eire 1996b. For the penetration of the *koine* in certain dialects, there are monographs by E. Nachmanson 1903 (Magnesia), E. Kieckers 1910 and M. J. Barrios 1996

(Crete), R. Nehrbass 1935 (Epidaurus), J. J. Moralejo 1973 (Delphi), R. Hodot 1990a (Asian Aeolic), A. Panayotis 1990 (Chalcidice), C. Brixhe 1993c (Caria and Licia; Laconia), G. Vottéro 1996 (Boeotia), C. Consani 1996 (southern Italy). For the late preservation of some dialects, cf. L. Zgusta 1980, p. 123 ff. For the Greek-speaking Eastern population in Rome, see J. Kaimio 1979, p. 21 ff. and I. Kajanto 1980, p. 89 ff. For Greek in the East, see the book by J. Kaimio and H. B. Rosen 1980, as well as the references already cited.

3. Colloquial koine and its variants

Colloquial 'koine'

252. It could be said that literary *koine* has a general norm: that of Attic reduced by certain innovations of the *koine* and later progressively added to by means of the phenomenon of Atticism. The differences are of a temporal and scholarly nature, as well as being differences between individual authors. In contrast, colloquial or spoken *koine*, also referred to as popular, cannot be regarded as unitary except to the extent that the literary *koine* served as a support, eliminating the more obvious deviations.

But deviations did exist. On the one hand, they were a product of the influence of other languages: above all, Egyptian in Egypt and Aramaic or Hebrew, although there is some doubt about the latter. On the other hand, they were a product of an evolution that we can only partly follow and date, since it is covered up by the fact that all our documents are written and therefore, in a certain sense, literary.

Frequently, popular *koine* can only be deduced from the mistakes of the literary texts. We are still left with the problem of differences in level within the spoken language, that is, between colloquial and vulgar language. There are also chronological differences, which I will discuss later, cf. §§ 264 ff.

So, the attempts to define the dialects of *koine* (of Egypt, Asia, etc.) are not often very productive and tend to be abandoned, cf. A. Thumb 1974, p. 167 ff. Although, at times, they have been undertaken again with the aid of new methods, as in the 'essay' by C. Brixhe 1984 on Anatolian Greek from the beginnings of the period under discussion.

253. It is almost impossible to describe literary and spoken *koine* separately, and the latter's social, local or temporal dialects.

Focusing for a moment on spoken, popular or conversational *koine*, we can only make a pan-chronic and pan-dialectal description dealing with certain characterisctics found here and there, with greater or lesser frequency and regularity, which one tries to date and localise. These characteristics must be obtained from all kinds of texts, including those of literary *koine* where they penetrate to a greater or lesser extent, whether in a normal way or as mistakes. Some have survived, in a more generalised form, in Modern Greek.

Before making such a description I will point out the variants within spoken *koine*, insofar as this is possible. They can be studied from various perspectives, since we are not looking at them from the perspective of the existence of strict dialects. Then I will deal with these, insofar as they result from the influence of languages with which Greek came into contact; I will examine the 'social' variants of a vulgar type; and when we attempt a description of the *koine* in the next chapter, I will provide examples of most of the variants, resulting from its evolution, although it is often fortuitous to fix their chronology and diffusion.

The influence of other languages

254. Starting with the variants resulting from the influence on Greek of the languages with which it came into contact, I will indicate the principal variants of these languages.

The clearest conclusions refer to Egypt, doubtless because it is here where our documentation, thanks to the papyri, is more abundant. Sometimes, we have exaggerated: for instance, cases such as the confusion of ο and ω, ει and ι, the pronounciation of -υ in αυ and ευ as a semi-vowel, the later loss of difference in quantity, the loss of inter-consonantal γ and of final -ν or the Ac. θυγατέραν, are general in *koine* and not specifically Egyptian. In contrast, the interchange of voiceless and voiced occlusives (they are not distinguished in Coptic) and, in certain positions, the voiceless and aspirated (these no doubt lost their aspiration) are features of the Greek of Egypt. A good description of the Greeek *koine* of Egypt can be found in C. Consani 1993, p. 27 ff.

Of course, Greek received linguistic borrowings from Egyptian, cf. P. Wahrmann 1907 and J. L. Fournet 1989.

Little of this is found in Syria and Palestine. The Aramaic substratum has been held responsible for the occasional spelling ο instead of α (πονδοχίο), the loss of nasals in groups or in intervocalic position

(Νυφικός), some prothesis (εἰσκότλα = Lat. *scutella*) and little else. Other characteristics, such as the elimination of the diphthongs αυ and ευ, the fricativisation of aspirated consonants, the Ac. pl. κοίτες, etc. are general. Regarding Anatolian *koine*, cf. W. Dressler 1963, C. Consani 1993, p. 30 ff. (and, earlier, A. Thumb 1974 [1901], p. 139 ff.). The trilingual inscription of Xanthus reflects an influence of Lycian in the Greek: sometimes the article is missing, there is much καί, καθιερόω with G. On the other hand, the Greek of Dura-Europos is very altered, no doubt through Aramaic influence (the prothetic vowel, G. instead of D., N. pl. instead of Ac. pl., indeclinable ἕνα, the thematisation of athematic nouns, nouns in -ιν). Yet, there was influence from the local dialects (Lycian, Pisidian) in Pamphylian: the tonic accent, frequent apheresis and metathesis, the glide after *i* and *u* in hiatus, the neutralisation of final *o/u*, the fricativisation of intervocalic *g* and *d*. At any rate, these are very marginal cases.

255. Nothing very definite is found in other regions. But we should at least recall the *vexata quaestio* of the Semitisms in the Greek version of the Old Testament (that of LXX) and the New Testament. In general, after the works of A. Deisman 1923 (cf. F. R. Adrados 1948, p. 132) and J. H. Moulton–G. Milligan 1914–29, it has become clear that these texts are practically *koine* and are very close to popular or conversational *koine*, despite the notable differences between them. Luke writes in a more literary Greek than the other evangelists. The 'Greek of the Jews' is not sufficiently known, if it existed at all, and some of the characteristics found in the two Testaments come from the Hebrew literary tradition; only some can be attributed to the Aramaic that was spoken there.

Many alleged Semitisms have been rejected; as, for instance, by A. Thumb 1974, p. 121 ff. Indeed, this has been the line followed by, among others, the well-known manual by F. Blass–A. Debrunner 1949, p. 3 ff.: many alleged Semitisms are simply *koine*, the clearest Semitisms being those of pure translation from the Hebrew in the LXX (and citations of these in the NT), and those of Jewish concepts translated into Greek. D. Hill 1967 has written a book about these 'Greek words with a Hebrew meaning'. But these authors are in a minority: for J. A. L. Lee 1983, after a detailed lexical study of the Greek Pentateuch, 'the Greek of the LXX should be considered as being essentially of its time' p. 146.

This is the most common view, although there is no lack of proposals regarding Hebrewisms and Aramaicisms. But true Aramaicisms from the contemporary language are rarely cited and they are surrounded by doubt.

256. For the influence of indigenous languages on *koine*, see in general A. Thumb 1974, p. 102 ff., V. Bubeník 1989, p. 198 ff., J. Niehoff-Panagiotidis 1994 and G. Horrocks 1997, p. 60 ff. With regard to the Greek of the LXX and New Testament (for descriptions see, for the NT, H. Pernot 1927, F. Blass–A. Debrunner cit. and B. Consani 1994), and, in addition to the references already cited, see works that stress the syntactic and stylistic features derived from the Hebrew bible: for instance, D. Tabachovitz 1956, K. Beyer 1962, C. F. D. Moule 1968 and H. B. Rosen 1979. On the New Testament as *koine*, see also L. Zgusta 1980, p. 126 ff. On the more educated Greek used by Luke, see among others, L. R. Palmer 1980, p. 174; on the more popular character of Mark, see J. Ch. Doudna 1961 (who places much emphasis on Semitisms). On the wide use of Greek in Palestine and the minimal presence of Aramaicisms in the inscriptions, cf. H. B. Rosen 1963, 1979 and 1980; for its scarcity in the NT, see V. Bubeník 1989, p. 67 (but they are more frequent in later Jewish literarure, as, for instance, in Flavius Josephus or the *Shepherd of Hermes*, cf. A. Hilhorst 1976). For the LXX in general, cf. N. Fernández Marcos, 1973.

L. Rydbeck 1967 represents a different sort of critique: one cannot strictly speak of a 'popular language', for the NT has many similarities with the technical Greek language of the first century AD.

257. The influence of Latin on Greek also failed to crystallise into the creation of local or regional dialects. Only in Egypt do some technical terms of the Roman army or administration appear to be translated by a particular word, but this could just be accidental. Common translations were often made: *consul* is ὕπατος, *senator* is συγκλητικός, *frumentarius* is σιτικός, *potestas* is ἐξουσία, etc.

The inscriptions, papyri and literary texts offer us an abundant mass of Latin vocabulary of the type mentioned. For example, for the New Testament see the great number of terms relating to military, judicial and administrative life as summarised by F. Blass–A. Debrunner. There are studies in which all of these elements can be found, although the more cultivated writers, such as Plutarch, tended to avoid this. In fact, the direction of borrowings generally went in the opposite direction, from Greek to Latin.

For the lexicon, S. Davis 1991 collects some eight hundred Latinisms from all periods in the papyri, but for the Hellenistic period he points out that we are dealing with a superficial phenomenon limited to

the world of the military and administration; and only in cases where satisfactory Greek translations did not exist (these have been collected by H. J. Mason 1974). Subsequently, in the age of Diocletian, there was another wave of Latinisms relating to administration and functionaries, but equally superficial. See § 258.

258. For other aspects of the language, the most productive or useful texts are the *senatus consulta*, treatises, laws, etc., which, for the eastern half of the empire, were often written in Greek (or Greek translations were provided) from translated Latin texts. These have been studied particularly by E. García Domingo 1973 and others. In these translations (and in inscriptions in general), as well as in the borrowings collected by Davis, we come across certain characteristics affecting phonetics and other aspects of Latin; but also characteristics helping to distinguish the Greek from *koine* when, for example, ι is pronounced instead of ει, and a fricative (Lat. *f*) instead of an aspirated (Gr. φ). Sometimes, it is a question of the adaptation of the Latin inflection of nouns (and adjectives, pronouns) to the Greek.

The syntactic characteristics include: forced translations of the gerundive (δεσμίους . . . ἀναμφθῆναι ἐφρόντισεν for *uinctos . . . remittendos curauit*); the Ac. of extension (χώραν προστίθημι . . . πόδας χιλίους for *agrum addo . . . mille pedes*); the indication of the father Λευκίου υἱός; the D. of place (ἐνείκησα παρατάξει for *uici . . . acie*); the manner of making a vow (ὀμνύειν εἰς τὸν Ουϊτέλλιον); the jussive subjunctive (δοῦναι κελεύσῃ for *dare iubeat*); certain subjunctives in subordinates (οἷς . . . ἐξηγήσωνται for *quibus . . . exponant*). Then there are clear semantic calques, which translate *eligo* for ἐκλέγω, *colligo* for συλλέγω, *dilectio* for καταλογή.

However, it is dangerous to attribute the presence of these or other *koine* characteristics in the Greek to a Latin influence. The subjunctive of wish is already present in the LXX (with earlier precedents); the subjunctive of subordination without ὅπως also has precedents. And the confusion of the perfect and aorist, which has sometimes been seen as a Latinism, has its own history.

259. The influence of Latin on Greek is negligible with regard to the formation of words and morphology. It has been proposed that nouns and adjectives in -ις, -ιν in Greek, where -ιος, -ιον is old, is a Latin influence; but it seems to be more a question of a phonetic

phenomenon. However, the suffix -αριος or -αρις is indeed a Latinism. In spite of everything, the lexicon had a significant influence: it reached Byzantium and Modern Greek and all its dialects. There are certain formal changes, such as λίμιτον from *limes*, δηνάριον from *denarius*, κόρτη from *cohors*. But sometimes the transfer of a word from Latin into Greek produced a semantic change: for instance, *calamarium* is 'writing reeds', but καλαμάριον is 'inkpot'; and Constantine's λάβαρον comes from a more general *laureum*. The phenomenon was repeated in Byzantium.

However, the influence of Greek on Latin in the lexicon and formation of words was more significant, giving rise, in Latin, to a special nucleus that we call Graeco-Latin, which had an enormous influence on later languages. See more about this in §§ 294 ff.

So, all in all, the influence on *koine* of the different languages in contact with Greek was quite negligible. Or, rather, it is badly reflected in the inscriptions, given that it mainly corresponded to pronounciations which rarely figure in the inscriptions, and to mistakes that the written texts eliminate in most cases. If subdialects of the *koine* were created at all, no doubt in a small measure, these are barely known to us and were not important for the later tradition.

260. In general, see A. Thumb 1974, p. 152 ff. and, for the New Testament, F. Blass–A. Debrunner 1949, p. 4. For the subject of Latin borrowings in general, cf. F. Viscidi 1944 and G. Horrocks 1997, p. 75 ff.; for the Greek of official use among the Romans, see P. Viereck 1888, H. J. Mason 1974 (administrative, political and military terminology). Also, L. Zgusta 1980, p. 131 ff. For the Latin lexicon in the papyri, cf. B. Meinersmann 1927, R. Cavenaile 1951 and especially Cerveka-Ehrenstrasser, I. M. Diehart, J. 1996. For the inscriptions, see A. Cameron 1931. The circumstances surrounding Latin and Greek in the Roman empire will be studied more closely in a later chapter.

Variants of colloquial 'koine'

261. Attempts have been made to reach conclusions on the local variants of the *koine* from what has survived of it in Modern Greek. For instance, after A. Hatzidakis 1977 (1892), attempts were made by A. Thumb 1974 (1901), p. 190 ff., and J. Niehoff-Panagiotidis 1994, p. 311 ff.

It is evident that characteristics of *koine*, whether in the Hellenistic or Roman period, survive in Modern Greek: the pronounciation of certain vowels and diphthongs (examples of iotacism and the

elimination of ευ, αυ, in particular), the fricativisation of aspirated voiceless occlusives (Lat. *f* for Gr. φ); forms such as the N. sg. ἀέρας, Ac. sg. γυναῖκαν, Ac. pl. γυναῖκες, N. pl. γραφῆς, verbs in -ίνω, ἔνι (mod. Gr. εἶναι), thematics instead of athematics (ἱστάνω, στάνω, στήκω, ἀφιστοῦμεν), aor. ἔλαβα; the loss of the dative (confusion of D. and Ac.), the dual, the perfect and the optative, the extension of the use of the subjunctive in the main clause (sometimes equivalent to the future), ἵνα + subj. instead of inf., the defective inflection of the participle, etc. More details are provided below, cf. §§ 330 ff., 425 ff. The difficulty is in fixing the dialects locally and temporally.

The attempts that have been made have taken into account the varieties within *koine* (in Italy, Crete, Cappadocia, Cyprus, Rhodes), varieties which descend at least in part from the old dialects (Tsakonian and Pontic). Certain differences in the pronounciation of -ζ-, the maintenance (or lack thereof) of the old geminates, the palatalisation (or lack thereof) of the gutturals, the preservation of the 3rd pl. -ουσι (for -ουν) and the extension of -ασι to the 3rd pl. of the aorist – are all attributed to old developments, from Attic to the Roman age.

It cannot be denied that this could be true, but it is far too conjectural. So, as I anticipated, there is no other solution when defining the general lines or the popular of conversational *koine* (including its impact on literary *koine*) than to provide a synchronic and spacially unitary type of description. The data can be extracted from all kinds of texts, including the literary texts.

262. Let us first look at a variant that we have already discussed, which is easier for us to understand, although we are dealing with a social, not a geographical or temporal, dialect: vulgar *koine*.

We have already looked at the vulgar register in Ionia (in Hipponax and others) and general references have been provided on Attica. It is now interesting to see how some vulgarisms, apart from those that seem to be mistakes, seem to have been consciously introduced by some authors in order to distance themselves from literary and elevated prose. I will refer to the Cynics.

I refer the reader to a previous work of mine (Adrados 1981), which is in turn based on another work by J. F. Kinstrand 1975 on Bion the Borysthenite, and an unpublished thesis by P. Perán on the *Life of Aesop*, whose cynical characteristics I have emphasised in various works. In both cases, vulgarism is definitely and consciously

sought for. Furthermore, since this is common in literary texts, however low their level may be, Hellenistic phonetics is much less obvious than in the 'mistakes', which authors such as E. Nachmanson 1910 and K. Dieterich 1898 have researched.

263. Bion displays some characteristics of Hellenistic phonetics (γίνομαι, γινώσκω, οὐθείς, πεινᾶ) and morphology (παυσάσθωσαν, lack of the dual, abundance of the diminutive and vocative); as well as syntactic and lexical characteristics.

The *Life of Aesop* contains traces of Hellenistic phonetics (iotacism, monophthongisation of diphthongs, the confusion of long and short *o*, -ιος > -ις, confusion in aspiration, etc.), and contains an abundance of expressive terms for physical defects and of Hellenistic vocabulary in general. For morphology, we can note the following: Ac. χεῖραν, εὐγενήν, N. n. βαθύν, numerals of the type δεκαπέντε, lack of augment (ἐπιτετάχει, εὗρον), inf. δηλοῖν, ἀναβεῖν, the change from one contracted form to another, from athematic to thematic (ἐτίθοντο, διδοῦντος, στρωννύεσθαι), aor. εἶπα, -ας, εὕρατε, perf. οἶδα, -ας, in the verb 'to be' ἦς, fem. part. εἰδώς, etc. In syntax, the Ac. is used instead of another case, the G. instead of D. (σοῦ εὐνοεῖ, also substituted by πρός + Ac.); the Hellenistic use of διότι, ὅπως, ἵνα: of the moods and tenses (ind. instead of subj., perf. instead of pret., periphrasis).

Short and interrupted dialogue is characteristic; mixture of tenses, with neutralised uses (historic present and *praesens pro futuro*); the καί style; expressions such as δώσω γνώμην τί ἔσται, οὐαὶ τῷ Αἰσώπῳ. Many of these characteristics are also found in colloquial *koine* in general, but the agglomeration and special uses in vulgar *koine* distinguish it from the colloquial.

It serves to be reminded that the difference between the popular and the vulgar is not always easy to define: both share many features, although literature does avoid certain words, expressions and turns of phrase, not to mention phonetics. The vulgar language should be seen as a subterranean substratum which only emerges by mistake or as a conscious literary resource. It also emerges in the *tabellae defixionis* and other vulgar inscriptions, and, at the beginning of the Byzantine period, in a remarkable text from the sixth or seventh century: the prose of the anonymous collection of the *Aesopic Fables*, referred to as the Vindobonensis, which consciously vulgarises a more educated earlier prose. Cf. F. R. Adrados 1948,

p. 67 ff. A similar case is that of Joannes Malalas, a contemporary of our collection, of whom more will be said later.

4. Colloquial koine: general description

264. The *koine* that was commonly spoken is referred to as colloquial or popular *koine*. Its phonetics is known particularly through the 'mistakes' of texts without any literary pretensions; the other areas of the language are known through these same texts and other more literary texts, particularly of the Hellenistic period. Literary texts, especially the oldest ones, coincide in many aspects of syntax and lexicon, in particular with conversational *koine*.

Since we are looking for common characteristics, let us eliminate those that we have registered as coming from contact with other languages. I would like to stress that, as we shall see, it is not a question of a temporally unitary language, for different characterisctics emerge in different dates, while others (or the same but in an earlier period) are only registered as a tendency (which sometimes culminates in Modern Greek). Indeed, some may begin as vulgarisms or as 'mistakes', and end up as regular characteristics.

265. Descriptions of *koine* can be found in general works, such as those by A. Meillet 1975, p. 253 ff., E. Schwyzer–A. Debrunner 1975 (*passim*) and R. Browning 1993, p. 19 ff. Specific works on certain aspects of *koine* (apart from the works cited previously on its origins and internal differences, and on the LXX and NT) include, on Greek papyri, E. Mayser 1926 ff. (Ptolemaic period), H. Ljungvik 1932, L. R. Palmer 1945, T. Gignac 1976 and 1981 (Roman and Byzantine periods), S. G. Kapsomenos 1958 (id.), B. G. Mandilaras 1973 (the verb); on phonetics. H. Pernot (1921); on the dative, J. Humbert 1930 and W. Dressler 1965; on the perfect, P. Chantraine 1927, p. 214 ff.; on syntax, F. R. Adrados 1988c and 1992e *(passim)*. Cf., in general, L. R. Palmer 1980, p. 174 ff. and G. Horrocks 1997, p. 65 ff. An elementary description is provided by W. R. Funk 1977. For certain evolutionary features, cf. H. Ljungvik 1932 and St. Wahlgren 1995. R. Browning provides an interesting comparison of the lexical use of NT and Atticists such as Phrynichus and Moeris.

For the lexicon, see in general, F. R. Adrados 1948, p. 31 ff. and 199 ff. (only words in *koine*). For 'Ionicisms' cf. for example, E. Mayser 1926, I, p. 20 ff. (a list following from papryri), F. R. Adrados 1948, p. 160 ff. (id. from the Aesopic fables and from numerous texts used in the comparison). For Attic words which are absent in *koine*, cf. for example, F. Blass–A. Debrunner 1954, p. 70 (particles) and, for individual authors, the references given in § 277. Lucian, *Rhet. mag.* 16 and *Lexiph.* 1 reproaches the pedantic use of a series of Atticisms.

266. A description of popular *koine* must start from what we already know. It is fundamentally Attic, with some rare Ionic or general forms, and an abundant non-Attic lexicon, also Ionic and general. However, it is not always the standard Attic of prose but very often the popular types of Attic. Yet, it should be pointed out that from the start, or gradually, new features emerged: sporadic features, reflecting new tendencies, or features generalised earlier or later.

267. *Phonetics.* During the Roman period the opposition of long and short vowels was lost, something which was presaged by the confusion of η and ε, ω and ο in Egypt from the third century BC, but with even earlier traces. Around the year AD 100, the poet Babrius disregarded the quantity of the penultimate in his choliambs, as he was more interested in the presence of the new tonic accent.

The vocalic system was totally transformed, following tendences which are rarely found in fifth-century Attic (examples of iotacism in inscriptions from the Academy: Ἀθινᾶ, Ἄρις) and which greatly penetrated fourth-century Beotian (closure of η into ει, monophthongisation of αι, etc.). In the Hellenistic period, the phenomenon of iotacism was clearly advanced (ι for η, ει) as well as the pronounciation of οι as υ; the elimination of the diphthongs ευ (> *ef, ev*) and αυ (> *af, av*) is difficult to date; the monophthongisation of αι dates from the Imperial period; and the evolution υ > *i* is Byzantine. These phenomena gradually came to create Modern Greek, but left little mark on the literary texts.

In short, the disappearance of the differences in quantity, iotacism, and the elimination of diphthongs are key, although these phenomena did not quite reach completion.

The consonantal system also underwent a drastic evolution. Aspirated voiceless occlusives became fricatives in the Hellenistic period; the voiced ones also became fricatives, except after a nasal; ζ became a voiced sibilant; *g* was lost in cases such as ὀλίος. These phenomena became regulated from the fourth century BC, the fricativisation of the aspirated stops came later, after Christ. See H. Pernot 1921 and E. Schwyzer–A. Debrunner 1975.

268. *Morphology.* Let us look at some notable characteristics. There is the sporadic appearance of Ac. πατέραν, from which in Modern Greek the N. πατέρας was created (ἀέρας in the third century AD). Above all, there is the disappearance of the D., following a sort of flourishing during the Hellenistic period (cf. Adrados 1992e, p. 219), and in the Imperial period (cf. J. Humbert 1930 and W. Dressler

1965); it has culminated in Modern Greek. But from an earlier date onwards we encounter the exchange of ἐν + D. and εἰς + Ac. There is also an Ac. pl. γυναῖκες, N. pl. γραφῆς, G. in -ου in the 3rd decl., all in the Imperial period. Also, the dual was lost.

Verbal inflection also contained some novelties. Since the Hellenistic era, the use of athematic verbs in -μι was more and more reduced in popular texts, as they tended to become thematic on -ω (δεικνύεις, ἐξώννυες, ὀμνύειν, δίδω, ἱστάνω); sometimes athematic verbs were replaced by other thematic verbs (χορτάζω replaced by κορέννυμι). There is an aoristic influence on the present (κρύβω), a new inflection of the aorist of the type ἔβαλα, -ες (εἶδα, ἦρθα), the replacement of thematic aorist by the sigmatic (κατέλιψα, second century AD); the confusion of augment and reduplication; regularisations of the type ἐθήκαμεν, οἴδαμεν, ἤμην; a reduction of the optative, almost limited to stereotyped expressions of wish, cf. statistics in A. Meillet 1975, p. 289 ff.; the value of the subjunctive future; the contamination, at times, of aorist and perfect (of the type ἐμισθώκαμεν) which presaged the loss of the perfect in Modern Greek (except for some which were left as aorists, such as βρῆκα); the extension of the passive aor. (ἀπεκρίθην) instead of the middle; the beginning of the part. with defective inflection, as in Mod. Gr.; the increase in periphrastic verbal inflections.

In conclusion, there was a tendency to reorganise the declensions, with a predominance of the vocalic stem and a reduction of the dative; and, in the verb, the elimination of the inflection in -μι, the disappearance of the optative and the perfect (or a fusion with the aor.), the confusion and even elimination of augment and reduplication, regularisations of the desinential system, etc.

269. *Syntax.* The system of cases evolved. As I explained in Adrados 1988c. 1989b and 1992e, the Ac. tended to become a general rule, eliminating some special uses, and the G. tended to focus on the function of determining the noun. As mentioned earlier, the D. disappeared, but much later on, and the use of prepositions increased.

We have seen how the frequency of use of the optative was almost totally reduced to stereotyped expressions of wish. The potential and the imperative tended to be substituted by futures. The subjunctive tended to be reduced to subordinate clauses, although its jussive use in main clauses was important in the Hellenistic period. As far as tenses were concerned, the perfect almost always became resultative,

its intransitive use with a present value being rare; it became almost the equivalent of the aorist, which presaged its eventual loss, as we have seen. However, the historic present is absent. The system of voices focused on the opposition of active and passive, the medium was reserved almost exclusively for reflexive and reciprocal use as a variant of the active. We have discussed the participle. Sometimes, we come across an infinitive with a subject, even if the subject is the same as that of the main clause. The frequency of subordination decreased, but there was an increase in the use of ἵνα + subjunctive, instead of the infinitives dependent on verbs of will and others.

270. *Lexicon.* First, there is the characteristic elimination of a large number of Attic terms and their replacement by other terms, whether new or from various origins. Sometimes, they are the Ionic terms which we have proposed as being at the same time Attic, belonging to the 'subterranean' or popular language. These and other terms also appear in the late Plato (cf. A. Díaz Tejera 1961) and in Xenophon (cf. L. Gautier 1911), among other authors: some were perhaps traditional terms from the same subterranean language which was now beginning to surface; others were new creations.

There is also a large number of words that are only found in *koine*: Ionicisms and new creations, above all. Of course, the frequency of abstracts and adjectives related to them is lower in popular as opposed to literary *koine*, but it increased considerably due to transfers between the two. Furthermore, there are words that can only be found in a particular region of the Hellenistic world (for example, in Egypt ἰδιόλογος 'administrator of private property' or θαλαμηγός 'a vessel'); but this may be accidental and in any case, it is a minor difference.

I would like to recall some conclusions which I presented in a very early work (Adrados 1948), but have not been picked up or considered by other scholars, or replaced with other studies. Indeed, this field has been largely ignored.

The point is, within the *koine* that dates before ca. AD 100 there is very little difference between the lexicon of the spoken and of the literary language (with the exception of vulgarisms and technicisms). Both the elimination of certain Attic terms and the admission of Ionic or other terms probably of a popular origin (and of certain abstracts and adjectives) are phenomena that affect the whole of the

language known to us. The most 'popular' texts, mentioned earlier (§ 245), and authors such as Polybius or Philo coincide fundamentally as far as the lexicon is concerned. All of the written language displays the same extraordinary development of the suffixes -ία, -μός, -ή, -εία, etc. and their corresponding adjectives; and of verbs with preverb; etc.

Then there is the case of special lexicon within popular *koine* (the phenomenon is without doubt more important in literary *koine*), as well as the 'hiding' of words (conventional synonyms) and words without meaning, and magical words in magical texts. Cf. M. García Tejeiro 1996.

5. Literary koine and its stages

The first stage

271. However much every written text of *koine* reveals a literary intention and hides, as far as possible, popular phonetics and language, it is clear that texts such as the LXX or the NT, not to mention the *defixiones* or private documents in papyrus, were directed at a non-educated public and were looking for a means of communicating with it; the writers tried not to distance their language too much from their audience. As regards the vulgar Greek of the *Life of Aesop* and other texts, we are dealing with a conscious and literary vulgarism.

Yet the majority of the prose texts written from the beginning of the second half of the fourth century BC onwards—I am not referring to poetic texts, which artificially resuscitated the old dialects—were aimed at an educated, international public, an elite within the different Hellenistic kingdoms and leagues of cities. The cultural background for prose was rooted in Attic, whose literary genres (philosophy, history, comedy, erudition, sometimes oratory) still survived. New genres such as the novel or the diatribe were added.

The idea was not to widen the cultural gap with Athens, which existed all the same. Therefore, people wrote in a language which was an intermediate so to speak, between Attic prose and conversational *koine*, with all sorts of gradations. It contained elements of both, which is why we have been able to use it to describe the conversational *koine*, particularly as regards the lexicon, however different it may have been in some respects, its similarities with Attic being more significant.

This is the prose we refer to as literary *koine* or literary Hellenistic *koine*, the first stage of its evolution in the Imperial period. Let us look at this in more detail.

272. The problem is that very few texts of the first literary *koine* have been preserved and even studied to the degree that they deserve. It was precisely the increase in the more Atticist prose from the start of this era, along with the increase in works of erudition and science in the period of the Roman empire, which led to the loss of the majority of Hellenistic literary prose. We have had to make do with a few scattered remains.

As mentioned earlier, the beginning of the first stage was marked by the late works of Plato, Xenophon, and Aristotle. Aristotle's works are, firstly, written in various registers; the esoteric being more literary, the exoteric being more popular and at the same time scientific. Secondly, Aristotle has barely been studied from a linguistic point of view, and the same applies to his disciple Theophrastus and others, whose writings have been preserved in fragments.

The texts which are useful for the study of literary *koine* of the Hellenistic period have been mentioned above (§ 245). We can add Diodorus of Sicily and Strabo, of a more recent date, in the Augustan period. Additionally, there are studies on specific points, but none of a general character.

273. For Menander, cf. D. B. Durham 1969 (1913, very partial, only deals with the lexicon); for Philo, M. Arnim 1912; for Aristeas G. H. Meecham 1935; for Epicurus, H. Widmann 1935 and P. Linde 1906; for Polybius, J. A. Foucault 1972; for the late Hippocratic writings, U. Fleischer 1939 and J. Mendoza 1976; for Diodorus, J. Palm 1955. The book by S. Wahlgren 1995 is also useful, cf. § 277 and G. Horrocks 1997, p. 48 ff.

274. Unfortunately, no study has been made on the whole of this type of *koine*: i.e. literary Hellenistic *koine* in its first stage. The works cited place particular emphasis on the lexical aspects: the lack of Attic terms, the appearance of 'Ionic' or recent terms, as mentioned previously. Although a general overview is lacking, some observations can be made on various aspects of the language.

To begin with, it should be pointed out that the writers of this period were very conscious of the existence of the two levels corresponding to literary and popular *koine*. So, in the Gospels, Luke uses traditional Attic words as opposed to the popular words used by the other evangelists: κρανίον for Γολγοθᾶν, φόρος for κῆνσον, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν for ἀπ' ἄρτι, σῶμα for πτῶμα, ἐσθίω for τρώγω, δέρω for κολαφίζω.

But the whole of the Gospels makes frequent use of a lexicon which was rejected by Atticists such as Phrynichus and Moeris, who drew attention to the 'Attic' and 'Hellenistic' words. Cf. R. Browning 1983, p. 47 ff.

We know, from the book by H. Widmann, that Epicurus displayed a series of non-Attic characteristics: frequent substantivisation of the participle, reduction of the difference between active and middle, periphrastic verbal forms, confusion of the aorist and perfect, use of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses, a reduction in the use of the optative, an increase in the use of prepositions, etc.

Some observations on the characteristics of Polybius and other authors (Strabo and Diodorus) can be added. A. Meillet 1975, p. 290 f. provides statistics on the rare use of the optative. J. Palm 1955 makes the following observations for Diodorus (apart from the large number of fluctuations due to the influence of his sources): strengthening of the cases with the help of prepositions; scant use, as mentioned, of the optative; rarity of the historic present; neuter pl. with sg. verb.; infinitives with the same subject as that of the main clause; periphrastic conjugation; etc.

Indeed, the first literary *koine* is characterised by rather negative as opposed to positive aspects: the lack or rarity of Attic and Atticist lexicon and grammar; the entry of new *koine* characteristics (in the lexicon and grammar), some of which were later eliminated.

But we should stress that Hellenistic literary Greek was not unitary. It contained the poeticising rhetoric of Hegesias of Magnesia, studied by E. Norden 1958 (1898), filled with a poetic lexicon and Gorgianic figures, as well as with Attic grammar: dismissed by Cicero, it nevertheless had a great impact on posterity. Also, we should point out the presence of technical and scientific prose, which was significant for the lexical development of Greek and which shall be further discussed.

Atticism

275. Towards the start of the imperial age, in the period of Augustus and Tiberius, there was a change in literary taste which steered the literary prose of *koine* in an archaistic direction. This movement, known as Atticism, was marked by the revaluation of Attic culture, and also had an impact on sculpture (and contributed to the loss of the former prose).

This movement found its origins among theorists of style such as Caecilius of Caleacte, Longinus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, although, earlier, Aristophanes of Byzantium had written about words which should be repudiated. Some believe it was rooted in the Asianism of Hegesias and other rhetoricians, while others (Philostratus in his *Life of the Sophists*)' believe it originated with the *rhetors* or 'Sophists' (the 'Second Sophistic') who were making declamations or *melétai* in public around this period, particularly on historic or imaginary themes: for example, a certain Nicetas, of which nothing has been preserved, and his successors such as Polemon (in the times of Trajan) and those that came later, starting with Herodes Atticus. At any rate, the new style dominated in educated prose and found its practical exponents in authors of dictionaries who, like Phrynichus and Moeris, drew attention to the proscribed words.

There is no doubt that the imitation of the ancients sought to elevate the Greeks to a superior cultural level than the Romans, and to provide them with a sense of identity. It is interesting to note that, as regards Christian Greek, this began at a popular level, but when Christianity reconciled with the Roman empire in the fourth century, its main representatives – Synesius, Basil, the two Gregories and John Chrysostom, among others – adopted Atticism (to the same extent as the last great pagans, Libanius and Proclus). With the closure of the Academy of Athens by Justinian (529), the balance definitely shifted towards the Christians, who were given the formidable task of continuing the Attic level of Greek prose and rescuing ancient Greek literature from obscurity.

276. It could be said that Atticism was adopted by the Greek higher classes, who needed a strong sense of identity to face Rome and needed to distinguish themselves from the populations who spoke a popular Greek. Although they often cooperated with Rome, they retained a feeling of cultural superiority, also regarding their value as a nation.

In general, there was a gradual reintroduction of an Attic lexicon and grammar. But the authors did not form a homogenous whole. Some preferred the Attic of prose, and there were those who filled it with poetic words, even taken from Sappho (Himerius). There were 'Sophistic' professionals, such as Dio Chrysostomus, the two Philostratuses, Aristeides and Favorinus, cf. the book by W. Schmid 1964 (1887–96), the fundamental work on the subject, and writers

influenced by them or 'part-time' Sophists, such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Dio Cassius, Arrian (editor of the work by Epictetus), Lucian, Aelian, etc. There is no complete study: the book by W. Schmid deals with Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Aristeides, Lucian, and Aelian, and is important but incomplete in certain respects, cf. Adrados 1948, p. 36.

This is not all. With the task of creating archaism, some authors imitated Herodotus, as for instance Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Josephus, or simply wrote in Ionic (as Arrian in his *Indikē*). Besides, there was the technical or scientific literature, which was somewhat Atticising, and Christian literature, which adapted itself to the movement from the fourth century onwards.

277. On the Atticists, cf. the book by W. Schmid previously cited, and my contribution in F. R. Adrados 1948, p. 31 ff. For precedents, cf. L. Zgusta 1980, p. 127. For Herodotisms, cf. S. Ek 1942 and 1946. For Christian literature, cf. for example, P. Gallay 1933.

The important book by S. Wahlgren 1995 draws a systematic comparison – for a series of characteristics such as the dual, anomalous conjugated forms, prepositions, particles, final and consecutive constructions – between the situation of classical and pre-classical Greek, the *koine* (LXX, Letter of Aristeas, Polybius and Diodorus) and of the early Imperial prose (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Nicolaus of Damascus, Strabo and Philo of Alexandria). The latter clearly displays the progress of Atticism, which reintroduced Attic forms or increased their frequency, always with differences according to the author and to the different linguistic features.

278. The fundamental thing is that the Atticisms (and poetisms) entered progressively. In my book of 1948, I established that from around the year 100, in the times of Trajan, then of Hadrian and Herodes Atticus, a new phase in literary *koine* began. Purism was all the rage, as reflected in the lexicon of Phrynichus and Moeris, mentioned previously, who distinguished what was Attic and Hellenistic. It was also reflected in certain satires, such as that of the character who in Athenaeus is called Κειτούκειτος because of his repeated question Κεῖται ἢ οὐ κεῖται; i.e., 'Is it documented or not?'. We have seen how Lucian, himself an Atticist, also satirizes the excesses of the Atticists.

Let us take the example, from the book by W. Schmid (I, p. 226 ff.), of Atticisms in Lucian, who is not the most exaggerated of the Atticists:

(a) *Morphology*. Among other things: pl. δεσμά, νεώς, ἅτερος, οἷ as indirect reflexive, ἠδυνάμην, impv. -όντων, μαντεύῃ besides Hellenistic forms.

(b) *Syntax.* Substantivisation of neutral, dual, plural adjectives of the abstacts, certain G. partitives, G. of agent, D. of relation, historic present, perf. with present value, imperative of middle perfect, final or consecutive infinitive, optative in subordinate clauses; etc., besides Hellenistic uses.

In my book cited above, I established (p. 195 ff.), while studying the lexicon of the Augustan collection of Aesopic fables, certain groups of Atticisms which did not enter the new literature until a certain date – for example, until the second or the fourth century—and which, because of this, can be used to date anonymous texts such as these (which cannot be assumed to have been written before the fourth century). Of course, one has to distinguish between Atticisms as such, prosaic Atticisms, and the poetisms of particular rhetoricians, which also increased with time. One also has to consider that technical literature is more moderate as regards Atticism. Furthermore, it would be useful to study other types of literature, as, for example, the novel or the different types of Christian literature.

In any case, Atticism is made up of many stages, as is the development of abstract vocabulary, which can be seen, for example, when comparing Polybius and Plutarch. Here, terms from the previous *koine* were admitted, but many more were added, usually of a literary type. It is particularly difficult to separate popular from literary *koine* in this period, the latter remaining almost hidden from us. There is also a difference between Atticising and poeticising literary *koine*, which is seen, for example, when comparing the Augustan Collection of fables and Aphthonius, both from the fifth century AD.

279. However, in the fables as in other literature, it was only at the start of the fourth century AD that Atticism began to retreat, faced with the fashion for popular and even vulgar language. This battle continued with varying results throughout the Byzantine and modern periods.

I would like to stress that we find ourselves in unexplored territory here, for we lack any systematic studies on the evolution of Hellenistic and Roman Greek (I have noted some exceptions) and especially on the variants of the different schools of Atticism and the Atticism of the different genres. In certain cases, we could be looking at a mixture of prosaic Atticisms and poeticisms, as in the collection of fables already referred to. Indeed, the same author could

change his style according to the genre he was using, something which is illustrated in Lucian and Plutarch.

The fact is that prose language progressively began to distance itself from conversational language, which becomes more and more difficult to define. This occurred whenever mannerisms were introduced for literary purposes, as with the Spanish imitators of Góngora or the French Symbolists: a series of steps had to be created to rennovate resources whose effect had been overused.

Consequently, Greek literature became increasingly elitist and aimed at a closed circle of readers, until the arrival of the Medieval period.

280. Before this, Greek had developed a remarkable literature through this artificial language (and the even more artificial language of poetry), in which Christian literature must be included. It laid the foundations for its survival as a language of culture. But more important was the growth of the literary lexicon and its influence on Latin. This Graeco-Latin lexicon made its way, through numerous obstacles, to arrive at the modern languages in which it survives as an essential element. We shall look at this in more detail further on, cf. §§ 294 ff.

To move on from the subject of the lexicon, it is worth looking at the modern study on the syntax of fifth- and sixth-century literature; I am referring to the work by K. Hult 1990. By comparing various authors, both pagan and Christian, from the centuries in question, this scholar managed to distinguish a group of four more 'literary' authors (Eunapius, Theodoret, Marinus and Procopius) from two more 'popular' authors (Palladius and Callinicus). There is a series of points in which they differ. For example:

Literary variants: ὑπό and πρός as agents, in final sentences with ὡς, ὡς ἄν, ὅπως ἄν, a future participle indicating intention, an absolute infinitive, an indicative in consecutives, τυγχάνω with participle in nominative case, D. of agent, etc.

Colloquial variants: purpose expressed by an infinitive with a preposition, direct instead of indirect style, ὅτι after verbs of thought and vision, impersonal passive, consecutive ἵνα and after verbs of willing, impersonal ἔτυχε with Ac. and infinitive, etc.

As we can see, there is a series of subtle variations, but from the year AD 100, it becomes difficult to gain access to popular *koine*: we only have access to different variants of literary *koine*, influenced by various tendences of Atticism, and to less influenced texts.

6. The evolution of the intellectual and scientific lexicon

Sources

281. To continue from where we left off (§ 237), let us look at the development of the Greek intellectual and scientific language in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. We are partly dealing with special terms (semantically modified or newly created) relating to different philosophies and sciences, and partly with a vocabulary with a general diffusion, at all levels, and in all the periods: the words themselves or the types of formation, derivation and composition passing into the whole literary sector of the later languages.

At the outset, it is important to make two observations. First, that there are no broad or up-to-date studies on the development of this lexicon, so that we have to make do with approximations. Second, that the collection and study of the Greek lexicon in dictionaries and special works is incomplete, or has been until now, because of a lack of lexicons, concordances and indexes of authors, and through the absence, even in the general dictionaries, of data that appear in the more specialised publications.

However, there are specialised dictionaries (of botany, geometry, rhetoric, etc.) which may be of use (see D. Lara 1997 and F. R. Adrados–D. Lara, 1998e). But dictonaries of philosophical terms, such as those of F. E. Peters 1967 and J. O. Urmson 1990, focus on content and neglect the lexicographic aspects. The same thing happens in specialist studies like that of D. Tsekourakis 1974 on ancient Stoic terminology (καθήκοντα, κατορθώματα, τὸ τέλος, τὰ αἱρετά, etc.). Fortunately, the recent publication of the *Repertorio bibliográfico de la lexicografía Griega* by P. Boned–J. Rodríguez Somolinos (1998) provides us with a very complete list of all that has been published in this field, which is a great aid to research.

Now, because of the data provided in the *Thesarus Linguae Graecae* (Irvine, California), and the *Diccionario Griego-Español* (I–VI, Madrid 1980–2002), the situation is starting to change. As regards the latter, I refer the reader to two works:

(a) F. R. Adrados–D. Lara (1998e), which provides an overview of the lexicon of different specialities and sciences and the corresponding bibliography, as well as its collection in the *DGE*. It also points out some problems: the difficulty of distinguishing between common and specialised use, the lack

of precision (at times) as regards the taxonomies, the lack of data, the transitions between normal or specific uses, etc. In addition, examples are provided of advances made in this area.

(b) F. R. Adrados–J. Rodríguez Somolinos 1998d and 2002–2003, which provides data on the enormous advance of the DGE V and VI compared to the dictionary by Liddel-Scott-Jones, as regards new words or new technical and scientific meanings of known words, which are exemplified with articles such as δεκάς, δῆμος or δίκη. It also points out, with respect to these volumes, *hapax legomena* that cease to be so and new words that were not collected until now.

Description

282. The scope of the intellectual and scientific Greek lexicon, whether we are dealing with specific words or meanings of others, with transitions ranging from the most specialised to common and conversational language, is immense. The ability to form new words is also without parallel; where we would form new phrases, the Greeks could form new words. It serves to recall the observation by Vendryès: 'there was never such a beautiful tool to express human thought'. Cf. F. R. Adrados 1968.

Throughout the Hellenistic and Roman periods, the lexical networks which we discussed above (§ 227) – created by the Presocratics and continued by the Socratics with repercussions on the common language–were perfected. They contained different kinds of nouns (abstract, action, agent, etc.), adjectives related to these as well as verbs and adverbs; in addition, variants functioning as preverbs, prefixes, and first elements of compounds. Thus, an infinitely flexible intellectual tool was created.

P. Chantraine provides a detailed study of the extension of the different formations across the centuries; for *koine* and later Greek, cf. for example, p. 190 ff. (-μα), 289 ff. (-σις), 320 ff. (-της). Specialised studies exist on some of these, many of which are cited in my work Adrados 1997b. In fact, they originate from the Ionic and Attic period, as I have explained in the appropriate context: but during the Hellenistic and Roman periods they reached an unrivaled level. In some of the examples of suffixes and different derivatives which I offered earlier, I placed much emphasis on this.

Above all, it is a question of abstract and action nouns in -ά, -ή -ία, -μα, -μός, -σις, -σύνη, agent nouns in -τής, etc.; adjectives in -ιος, -(τ)ικός; and a series of corresponding verbs. Also, compounds and derivatives with prepositions. There was a tendency to create systems in which nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbs correspond, systems which had parallels with others with initial prepositions or with compound forms. This was subsequently imitated in all the world's languages.

Many of the words from which these lexical networks are formed did not emerge until the fifth or fourth century BC and were later diffused, sometimes becoming specialised and changing in semantics, in the Hellenistic period or later. For example, ἀπαθία and διάνοια descend from Herodotus, αὐτάρκεια and διαφορά from Democritus, αἴσθησις from Anaxagoras, ἀπάθεια from Aristotle; they were then widely diffused, with various meanings, along with their derivatives.

For instance, if, in the eighth century (Homer) we find αἱρέω, only in the fifth century do we find the abstract αἵρεσις (Hdt.), which later survived in various literary genres and with various semantic specialisations; in the fifth/fourth century αἱρέσιμος (X.), in the fourth century αἱρετός (pl., Isoc.), in the fourth/third century αἱρετιστής (Philem.), αἱρησιτείχης (Diph.), in the third century αἱρέσια (Delos inscription), -ετέος (Chrysipp.), -έτης (LXX), -ετίζω (Hp., *Ep.*, LXX), -ετικός (pl., *Def.*), -ετισυός (LXX), in the first century BC/first century AD αἱρεσιομάχος (Ph.), in the second century AD αἱρεσιάρχης (S.E., Gal.), in the third century AD αἱρεσιώτης (Porph.), in the fourth century AD αἱρεσιαρχέω (Gr. Naz.), αἱρεσιλατρία (Did.). The lexical network grew across the centuries, across literary genres, and across both pagans and Christians.

The same applies in the case of prepositional compounds, for example, those with δια-: διαίρεσις appears in Hdt., in the fifth century, as does the verb διαιρέω; then there is διαιρετός and διαιρετικός in pl., διαρέτης in an inscription from the third century BC, διαρετήρ in Philod. (first century BC) and διαιρετέος, διαίρημα in Them. and Dam. respectively (fourth and fifth century AD). For the documentation, as in the previous case, see the *DGE*. The conclusion is analogous.

283. To be sure, the Greek language created lexical systems which soon began to proliferate, such as λογίζω/-ισμα/-ιστής (from which we obtain -ιστικός, -ιστεία)/-ικός/-ιμος; βουλεύω/-τής/-μα/-τήριον; φίλος/-έω/-ημα/-ία/-ικός; δράω/δρᾶσις/δρᾶμα (from which we obtain

-τικὸς) / δράστης; etc. However, the derivatives from prefixes are no less prolific (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, etc.) and compositional elements (ἀ-/ἀν-, αὐτο-, εὐ-, φιλο-, ἀρχι-, etc.). In the *DGE*, there are around 800 words with αὐτ and αὐτο, around 1,750 with ἀπο-, 50 with ἀγαθο-, 250 with ἀρχι- (ἀρχε-, ἀρχ-). Note that most of this type of vocabulary is present in all the written language.

284. Another line of enquiry in the study of Greek lexicon, complementing the previous one, deals with formative elements: terms which enter into compounds and derived words, like suffixes. We have briefly looked at the treatment of the lexicon in the archaic and classical period, but there were enormous advances in the period that we are studying. I refer the reader to my work Adrados 1997b and its bibliography. For the extension of certain suffixes, cf. R. Browning 1983, p. 38 ff.; for the new meanings of some words, p. 42.

Below, I provide some statistics (which also include even the most ancient Greek, as there are no studies based on dates or genres) regarding noun and adjective suffixes. They come from the *reverse index of Greek* by C. D. Buck–W. Petersen 1944. Some frequencies:

-ιος, -ιον: 12,000
-ια, -ιη, -ια: 7,500
-μός, -μόν, -σμός, -ισμός: 4,000
-μα, -ασμα, -ισμα: 3,300
-της (-τας)/-τητος, -τατος: 500
-της (-τας)/(-του), etc., -ιστής: 5,400
-σις, -ξις, -ψις, -τις: 5,400
-κός, -κόν, -ιακός, -τικός: 7,200

It would be interesting to distribute the frequencies chronologically, as there was a continuous increase.

285. I think that this can give us some idea of the volume, the characteristics and the evolution of the intellectual vocabulary of Greek. Using Indo-European resources for word formation, it represented a remarkable advance comparable to that of science, philosophy, and thought in general.

It laid the foundations for the development of this type of lexicon in the coming periods, although this occurred largely through an intermediate stage, still to be studied, which we refer to as the Graeco-Latin lexicon. It is simply the last of the Greek grafts which

Latin received from Plautus onwards, which enabled it to become a language of culture, a base for those which followed and continued to receive Greek grafts.

7. Greek and Latin in the Republic and the Empire

The contact of Greek with other languages

286. Greece and the Hellenistic kingdoms were conquered by Rome in the third century BC. The process extended through the conquest of southern Italy and Sicily (Tarentum fell in 272, Agrigentum in 262, Syracuse in 212) to the defeat of the Macedonian king Perseus by Aemilius Paulus in 167 BC (Greek resistence came to an end with the fall of Corinth in 146) and the collapse of the Hellenistic kingdoms (Pergamum was legated to the Roman empire in 133 BC, Pompey conquered Syria in 64 BC, and Caesar conquered Alexandria and Egypt in 30 BC). At this time, and later, Rome seized almost all of the countries on the Mediterranean, culminating its advance in the period of Trajan (AD 98–117): its dominion extended from England to the Euphrates, from the Danube (and beyond, in Dacia) to the Sahara.

Latin imposed itself wherever it came into contact with languages of more primitive cultures (in Italy, Gaul, England, Hispania, Germania, Pannonia, Illyria, Africa), and in Greek cities in some of these places, the old colonies of the Mediterranean coast.

However, Rome's encounter with the Greeks from the third century BC onwards (following another encounter of lesser intensity from the seventh century onwards) had a rather unexpected outcome: the Hellenisation of Rome. It was a Hellenisation of the culture, literature and language of Rome. A conquered Greece in turn conquered its fierce victor, or as Horace puts it: *Graecia capta ferum cepit uictorem* (*Epist.* II 1, 156–157).

287. However, the outcome was different in the East. Here, Greek was maintained, not just in Greece but also in the Hellenistic kingdoms of Asia, where it had only been a superstratum on the indigenous languages.

Greek was maintained for a long period in Sicily and in Marseille, but it succumbed in the end. In Africa it enjoyed a period of splendour after the fall of Carthage, then after Justinian's invasion, but it did not succeed in imposing itself. In Greece and the East, Latin

was the official language, but Aemilius Paulus spoke in Greek with Perseus; Licinius Crassus delivered his pronouncements in Greek; Agrippa, king of the Jews, was allowed to speak before the Roman senate in Greek; and the Romans themselves communicated with the Phoenicians, Jews, and Syrians in Greek. In Egypt, Romans allowed Greek to be used from the very start, as opposed to the indigenous language. In fact, not even the generalisation of the Roman citenzenry under Caracalla was able to impose Latin in any generalised way. In short, Greek was the language of the educated and urban populations and the international language of the East. Indeed, Latin only managed to impose itself in the newly conquered territories, in Pannonia, Thrace and Dacia, with the help of the new colonists.

The military, judicial, and part of the administrative vocabulary, as mentioned previously, became generalised. In Byzantium, it was the official language until Justinian, and it was used above all in inscriptions and titles of honour. However, from a much earlier date, discourses were pronounced in Latin, followed by translations; edicts and other inscriptions were published in both languages (such as the *Res gestae* by Augustus) or simply in Greek (as many edicts by Hadrian). H. Zilliacus and J. Kaimio have made a very detailed study of the use of Greek in public inscriptions, political life, legal language, and its role in private life and as a language of culture.

In fact, there was never any kind of anti-Greek policy, and although this language had great prestige on the one hand, and yet was considered inferior on the other hand, a state of bilingualism was reached in the East and the West, and was resolved in two different directions.

The result was two-fold. On the one hand, Latin became filled with Greek expressions, words and constructions, derived from the Hellenising culture which it encountered and from the fact that Roman society, at the higher level, became bilingual. On the other hand, geographically speaking, Latin had to share its territory with Greek, which was maintained, as we mentioned, in the East (and sometimes moved to the West through cultural means or carried by the Eastern diaspora).

Furthermore, within the Eastern empire there were period and local differences. Latin was the preferred official language of Constantine and later of Theodosius and Justinian, who maintained it, as I

stated, as the official language. At the most, translated versions of documents were published in Greek; Latin was also the language of law and jurisprudence, so that whenever translations were made they were full of Latinisms, cf. L. Burgmann 1991. However, the emperor Julian, for instance, preferred Greek, Arcadius allowed the use of both languages before the tribunals, and soon legal texts were paraphrased and translated into Greek. In Egypt, the use of Greek dominated, with a few exceptions.

288. So much for the official use: it is clear that in the East, Greek was the language of the higher and middle classes, as well as of most writers, which explains why it ended up imposing itself in all fields.

The Roman empire therefore became bilingual in two ways. In the West, Greek was at the same time the language of lower class immigrants and the language of educated society; in the East, Greek was the language commonly spoken by the educated classes and Latin held sway over the administrative and official sectors (this was lost, however, in the Byzantine period). This rather complex situation was accompanied by a love-hate relationship, in which the Romans admired the Greeks for their culture but despised their weakness and decadence, while the Greeks despised the Romans for their lack of culture and arrogance but admired their discipline and power. Yet there were also Greek Romanophiles and Roman Greekophiles, and all sorts of intermediate positions.

Greek in Rome

289. Let us go back to the origins. Greek influence on Latin resulted in a total renovation. First in literature: the Saturnian was replaced by the hexameter; the *fescennini* and the Atellana by a Greek type of comedy; *annales* and the *elogia* by the Hellenising epic, history and lyric; even tragedy was adopted and, later on, philosophy and oratory. During the Augustan period, the first influence of contemporary Hellenism was substituted by that of earlier literature, which was classic and still archaic: classic oratory and history, archaic lyric and epic. The first Latin literature was a translation from the Greek (Livius Andronicus translated the *Odyssey*) or was written in Greek (Fabius Pictor, Cincus Alimentus); and much later, Roman authors such Suetonius and Marcus Aurelius continued to write in Greek.

When this new Latin literature emerged, it contained original features, of course, but in some ways it was also a continuation of the Greek.

Certain factors must be taken into account in order to fully understand this. Firstly, something we have already touched upon, namely, the influence of Greek on all the languages of the Mediterranean, from the archaic period to, above all, the Hellenistic period, due to wars and conquests as well as trade. Subsequently, an enormous Greek-speaking population (Greeks, Jews, Syrians, etc.) became established in Rome, as extensively attested in the inscriptions. Juvenal scornfully refers to the *Graecam urbem* (III 61). Secondly, the factor of the modernity and the strength of influence exerted by Greek literature, which ended up erasing ancient Latin literature and replacing it with a new, very Hellenicised literature to which I have just referred. Thirdly, the bilingualism of the Roman educated classes, who learned Greek and finished their training or education in Greece (although many of the Greek also learned Latin). Indeed, Roman conquerors from the second century BC, such as Aemilius Paulus (who annexed Macedonia after his victory in Pydna in 168) or the Scipios were fervent Hellenisers. Even the hostage Polybius managed to introduce Hellenism to the Roman aristocracy.

290. In the letters of Cicero and in many anecdotes relating to Caesar and the conspirors who murdered him, to Augustus, Tiberius and so many other personalities, the Latin text is interspersed with passages or replies in Greek. It was in Greek that Caesar delivered his famous pronouncement to cross the Rubicon ('the dice are thrown'); that Caesar spoke to Brutus when he was assassinated ('you too, my son?'); that Augustus reproached Asinius Pollio for admitting Timagenes into his house ('you are feeding a wild beast'); and that Tiberius spoke when he drew someone into his confidence.

Greek was also used as the language of love, as attested in Lucretius IV 1160 ff. and criticised by Juvenal VI 196 ff. Although circumstances later changed in the West, for in the fourth century only the higher classes and technical writers had a command of Greek.

Above all, Greek was an intellectual language and the language of literature and science: these were either written in Greek or in Latin filled with a Greek vocabulary which was more or less assimilated, and even with Greek words written in Greek characters. Cicero's letters and Ausonius's poems are littered with Greek phrases.

Those of Augustus, Claudius and Tiberius are filled with Greek words, although this does not include oratory or political works, nor the *Acts* (but Claudius did speak Greek in the Senate, according to Suet., *Claud.* 42).

Thus, a part of Latin absorbed so many Greek elements that it turned into what I have referred to as Graeco-Latin, which would play a decisive role in the diffusion of ancient cultures and languages in the Middle Ages and indeed in all the succeeding periods until the present day.

291. The origin of this phenomenon is in the early influence of the Greek language on the Latin language, which was essential for facing new cultural circumstances. We are particularly familiar with this phenomenon from the Hellenistic period onwards.

The influence took place in various stages: in the archaic, republican and imperial periods; and by various means: oral, literary, scientific and ecclesiastical. I believe I have provided sufficient data on this.

It should be observed that at the end of Antiquity, familiarity with Greek diminished: in Rome it was still very much alive in philosophical and theological circles and among the aristocracy, but it was hardly known outside the city. Yet, cultivators of Greek continued to exist. The emperor Gratian officially established its teaching in Gaul (376), where Ausonius's circle was active in Bordeaux; the British Pelagius assisted the synod of Diospolis in 415 and impressed everyone with his mastery of Greek. The councils, always celebrated in the East, enlightened the western bishops on the importance of Greek.

Let us stop here for a moment. The Neoplatonists, particularly Plotinus and Porphyry, had the greatest influence on western thought during the fourth and fifth centuries. There were those who had a good mastery of Greek, such as Macrobius, Calcidius (translator of the *Timaeus*) or Hilary of Poitiers; and those who had mastered it to a lesser extent, such as Saint Augustine, who came to Platonism through the *Hortensius* of Cicero. Then there were the Hellenising poets, such as Ausonius, Claudian and Dracontius.

Translations played an important role. In the third to the fourth centuries we have the *Hermeneumata* of Ps. Dositheus, which include translations of Greek fables into Latin (the whole fabulistic genre consists of adaptations of Greek). Among the Christian translations,

we must mention the oldest translations of the Bible (*Vetus Latina*), which were very non-literary, literal translations; the *Vulgata* by Jerome, which, for the Old Testament, also translates from Hebrew and is relatively literary; and the translations of the *Acts* of the councils. Rufinus and Jerome translated Eusebius and Origen, the Cappadocian Fathers, etc. The style gradually improved in the direction of Atticism: as shown in the translation by Evagrius of the *Life of Saint Anthony* by Athanasius, when compared with a previous translation.

292. All in all, Greek was cultivated to a lesser extent in this period. It flourished, however, in Italian court circles under the Ostrogoths of Theodoric (493–526), who were familiar with it due to its cultivation in the East, where Ulfila translated the Bible into Gothic. The Hellenised philosophy of Symmachus and Boethius date from this period; the work of the latter being very prodigious, although he was unable to complete his translation of the entire works of Plato and Aristotle into Latin. Also from this period is Priscian, who, while living in Constantinople, wrote his *Grammatica* on the Greek model. Somewhat later, in the sixth century, Cassiodorus lived in gothic Italy and wrote on historical and theological subjects.

Many translations from the Greek into Latin date from this period, some by Dionysius Exiguus and Saint Martin of Braga (monastic writings). Somewhat later, in the seventh century, we have Isidore, who in Visigothic Spain, in his *Etymologiae* and other works, left a kind of testament of the whole of Antiquity.

This cultivation of Greek is reflected in Latin Hellenisms, which will be emphasised here (not just lexical Hellenisms, but Hellenisms in general).

293. On Latin expansion and its relation with Greek in general, see R. J. Bonner 1930, H. Zilliacus 1935, J. Marouzeau 1949, p. 125 ff., J. Kaimio 1979 and L. Zgusta 1980, F. Bivillee 1990, p. 21 ff., S. A. Tovar 1990, p. 41. More specifically, see, on the situation in Rome, H. Kajanto 1980; in Palestine, H. B. Rosén 1980; on the border of Greek and Latin in the Balkans, see B. Gerov 1980. On the bilingualism of the educated classes in Rome, see J. M. Pabón 1939, L. Zgusta cit., p. 138 ff. On the emergence of Latin literature, see Adrados 1994b. On the relations between Greeks and Romans in general, and their estimation of each other, see S. Swain 1986 (and my review in *Emerita* 65, 1997, pp. 374–75). On late Hellenism, see W. Berschin 1969–70. On the concept of 'Sprachbund' or the Graeco-Latin linguistic league, J. Kramer 1983. This author proposes the existence of a series of characteristics in the evolution of Greek and Latin during the Republican and Imperial periods, resulting from the intense contact between

these two languages. Thus, in phonetics, we have the lenition of intervocalic occlusives, the palatalisation of velar occlusives before a preceding *e* or *i*, the fricativisation of intervocalic *b*, the loss of aspiration and of the differences in quantity and the monophthongisation of diphthongs; in morphology, the introduction in Latin of new types of declension, the transfer of Greek suffixes into Latin and Latin suffixes into Greek and the reduction of the case system (with the advance of the Ac.); in syntax, the decline of constructions with infinitive, the dative absolute of Greek, the different periphrastic verbal forms, the tendency in vulgar Latin towards a central positioning of the verb, as in Greek, etc. Cf. G. Horrocks 1997, p. 73 ff. On Greek and Romance, Cf. W. Dietrich 1995.

8. Hellenised Latin and Greek-Latin

294. The Hellenisation of Latin can be followed from the second century BC onwards, together with the Hellenisation of literature. The social circumstances described provide an adequate explanation of this process: the influence of spoken Greek where the two populations were in contact or interrelated, the cultural influence of literary and scientific Greek. It was a process that was continued, with increasing intensity, throughout Antiquity.

Phonetic and morphological adaptation varied depending on the route of entry of the Greek elements and on their date.

With regard to phonetics, a classic transcription exists in which, for instance, the voiceless aspirated are transcribed in Latin as such: *ph, th, ch.* But, particularly in the archaic period, diverse transcriptions were produced (for example, *ampulla, purpura, Poenus*, etc.), which shed light on the phonetics of Greek and Latin at the time of the loan. For instance, there are Greek words that were taken before the alteration of the Latin vocalic system and others after it. Similarly, there are transcriptions of φ as *p* and as *ph*, and later others as *f* or *b (Orpheus, baselus)*; there is β transcribed as *b* and *u*, etc.

Linguistic borrowings also provide information on various details, such as the origin of certain borrowings in the Greek dialects of Italy and Sicily (*machina* with Doric *ā, Achiui, Argiui, oliua* with digamma, *Ulixes, sc(h)ara*, etc.) or on the languages of mediation (especially Etruscan, it is thought, in cases such as *Proserpina* or *persona*, from πρόσωπον).

295. Systems of morphological adaptation were also created. For instance, the first Greek declension, in -α, -η and -ας, -ης was reduced in Latin to *-a: nauta, poeta.* But alterations of the type *Tarentum* for

Τάρας, *Agrigentum* for Ἀκράγας, *bracchium* for βραχίων, *trigonus* for τρυγών, *aulona* for αὐλών are frequent, as is the mixture of inflections *(Piraea)*. However, sometimes the strict Greek form was respected *(Achates, Pelides, agon, andron)*, depending on the level and style of the language.

Nearly all verbs passed into the first conjugation: not just *machinari* from μαχανᾶσθαι but also *exanclare* from ἐξαντλεῖν, *hilarare* from ἱλαρόω, *tornare* from τορνεύειν. But it is important to note that, exceptions aside, sometimes we are dealing with Latin derivatives: *coaxare* (from κοάξ), *paedicare* (from τὰ παιδικά), *stomachari* (from στόμαχος), *pausare* (from the aor. of παύειν).

But I will not go into further detail on aspects relating more to Latin than Greek. The significant thing is the absorption of the Greek vocabulary, whether on the cultural level or on other levels. The Latin language was enriched by a panoply of roots and formative elements; it even altered its phonological system, permitting, for example, finals in *-n*, and its morphological and syntactic systems, admitting constructions identical to the Greek.

296. The fundamental work continues to be that of O. Weise 1882. One should add the various works by F. Biville cited in the bibliography and, among many others, the works of J. Marouzeau 1949, J. André 1971, A. Ernhout 1954, M. Leumann 1948 and 1968, G. Devoto 1968, pp. 86 ff., 117 ff., 147 ff., 184 ff., H. Lüdtke 1974, p. 37 ff., 59 ff., G. Lagunz 1995 and my work of 1997b. For fourth century pagan authors, see R. Moes 1980. Suffixes with a Greek origin can be found in L. Delatte and others 1981. For the Greek influence on vulgar Latin, see E. Coseriu 1977.

I also use two papers by L. Pérez Castro 1997 (on Quintilian) and F. Hernández González 1997 (on Faventinus). All the same, the subject deserves a new systematic study to define the different tendencies, according to date and author, in the acceptance or rejection (by means of calques, etc.) of Greek lexicon and syntax. No systematic study has ever been made.

297. In continuation, I will sketch the fundamental lines of Greek influence on Latin in the different areas of language, starting with the lexicon.

To take a few examples, we find Greek lexicon in the *Carmen Auvale* (*triumpus*), Livius Andronicus (*cothurnus, purpureus*), Naevius (*barbarus, melos, nauta*), Plautus (*absinthium, basilica, comoedia, emporium, peplum*), Terence (*musicus, scaenicus*), Catullus (*ambrosia, astrum, satyrus*), Lucretius (*cycnus*), Virgil (*calthus, magicus, narcissus*), Cicero (*astrologia, bibliotheca, epigramma, geometria, schola*), Tertullian (*apostolus*), Ammianus (*geographus*), etc.

The oldest borrowings were oral and came from conversational language: they referred to the sea and maritime trade; they included the vocabulary of luxury, games and pleasure; domestic conversation; and the arts and sciences. Later, the poets played a decisive role, particularly since the Alexandrine school.

I have only cited a few examples, in which there is a dominance of things which were unfamiliar to the Romans and came from the intellectual vocabulary.

The introduction of Hellenisms had begun in the fifth century BC, with terms that were influenced by Etruscan, as we have seen (*triumpe, amurca, sporta, persona*) or otherwise (*camera, gubernare, oleum, Pollux*); it increased after the Samnite wars, starting from 330 (*mina, dracuma, techna, talentum, balineum, catapulta*) and was stepped up through the literary and scientific route mentioned.

Of couse, there were reactions against this, such as the expulsion of rhetoricians and philosophers in the years 173, 161 and 154; the rejection of Greek words in official oratory; and the efforts by Cicero, Quintilian, etc., to create Latin equivalents of Greek words, see § 300.

This Hellenistic lexicon became increasingly larger in bulk in the later literature, which included Christian literature. Enormous increments are recorded in Plautus, the Republican and Augustan poets, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Cicero, Tertulian, the *Historia Augusta* and Jerome. These and other data, along with the distribution of the lexicon in semantic areas, can be found in the book by R. Moes 1980, which records the Hellenisms in Jerome, the *Letters*, the book *De rebus bellicis*, Ammianus, Claudian, and the *Historia Augusta*. Devoto's statistics, p. 193, for literary authors from Catullus to Persius (via Ovid, Tibullus, Propertius, Horace, *Ep.* and *Sat.*, Juvenal), reveal that the proportion of Hellenisms oscillates between 10 and 20 percent.

298. Christian Hellenisms are very important. We are dealing with words which, with a change in meaning, have remained fixed in the Latin language (words like *angelus, baptisma, euangelium, christus, ecclesia, episcopus, liturgia, monacus, presbyter, monasterium*, etc.) and with words, such as *eremita*, which were created from Greek. This is because, at a certain point, Latin was converted in the West into the language of the Church, which nevertheless inherited much from its Greek phase, which continued in the East. It should be noted that we are not just dealing with direct borrowings (sometimes with morphological adaptation), but also with calques, such as *spiritus* for πνεῦμα (but

sometimes a calque was attempted and failed, as when *tingere* gave way to βαπτίζειν).

O. Weise records a total seven thousand Latin Hellenisms in his book of 1882, the pioneer work on this subject. Clearly, this number should be increased.

Latin Hellenisms are useful for the understanding of Greek; not just the phonetics, but also the lexicon: in Latin there are Greek words and acceptance of Greek words which are documented there before they are in Greek (cf. for example, ἀήρ 'atmosphere', 'air' in the *DGE*, fifth century II 1).

299. On the other hand, it is not just a matter of borrowings, but also semantic calques, resulting in the creation of new words. Both tended to remedy what Lucretius (I 832) referred to as *patrii sermonis egestas*, the poverty of the mother tongue. Plautus translated φιλογύναιος for *mulierosus*, Cicero transformed συνείδησις, ποσότης and ποιότης into *conscientia, quantitas* and *qualitas*. He used *conuenientia* instead of ὁμολογία, *aequilibrietas* instead of ἰσονομία; sometimes he hesitated (*notitia rerum, cognitio* or *intellegentia* for ἔννοια). Frequently, it took some time to find an equivalent: πάθος is not *passio* until Saint Augustine. The process continued: *accentus* for προσῳδία, etc.

The bilingualism of the educated classes of Rome and, at times, of the population that coexisted with Greeks and Eastern peoples established in Rome, and of the traders and artisans explains Graeco-Latin 'monsters' such as *sescentoplagus, Pompeiopolis, cistophorus*, etc. This system of word formation continues to this day (sp. *automóvil*, etc.).

300. It is necessary to study in greater detail (and it must be stressed that no such study has yet been realised) the behaviour of the different authors with regard to the acceptance or rejection of the Greek lexicon, depending on factors relating to date, literary genre and personality. See L. Pérez Castro 1997.

To take an example, in the *Institutiones Oratoriae* by Quintilian there is mention and sometimes criticism of Greek adaptations to Latin by authors such as Plautus or Cicero (who in the *Acad. post.* I 7, 25 states 'I will make an effort to speak in Latin'), as well as his own numerous proposals. He accepts, for example, *essentia* for οὐσία because 'there is no Latin name' (III 6, 23) and *conclusio* for ἐπίλογος (in the *Rhet ad Her.* 1, 4); he translates καθολικά for *uniuersalia* '*ut dicamus quo modo possumus*' (II 13, 14); he prefers *uis* for δύναμις to other proposals, *potestas, facultas* (II 15, 3); etc.

But Hellenisms were not incorporated to the same extent by all authors, and not all Hellenisms were the same. Cicero often reacted against them (see *Orator* 49, 164, *De officiis* I 111 and the aforementioned passages) and used them more restrictively than the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Some ancient Latin voices remained definitively fixed by him as the equivalent of the Greek: *sapienta* for σοφία (cf. Afranius 299), *ars* for τέχνη, *casus* for πτῶσις, *ratio* for λόγος, *causa* for αἰτία.

Some terms calqued from Greek compositional methods (*altitonans, horrisonus*, compounds in *-ficus, -gena, -gradus*, etc.) were reserved for poetry. Similarly, some exact transcriptions of the N. of the first declension in *-e*, the Ac. and the second declension in *-n*, etc.

Faventinus, who produced an abbreviated edition of Vitruvius, struggled with his Greek terminology (sometimes leaving the Greek, other times suggesting Latin calques), adapting it to a 'humble language' for private use.

301. In the long run, a large proportion of the Greek lexicon remained firmly established in Latin and, more importantly, formative Greek elements such as -της, -μα, -τρία (> *-ta, -ma, -tria*) and so many more whose diffusion has been studied by J. André 1971; there are also verbal elements, such as -ίζω (> *-izare*), -ίσσω (> *-issare*), cf. M. Leumann 1948. In addition, suffixes related to Greek, such as *-icus, -men, -mentum*, etc. were diffused. In fact, all these suffixes came to form a single system, in which other Latin suffixes were also admitted, such as *-osus*, sometimes with shades of differences among them. Similarly, there was a tendency towards a unique system of prefixes and preverbs, which were at the same time Greek and Latin: *a-/in-, hiper-/super-, peri-/circum-*, in addition to those which were only Greek or Latin.

Yet Greek suffixes have a lesser scope for use in Latin than they do in Greek: for the 920 cases of -ισμός in Buck-Petersen, there are 65 examples of *-ismus* in Latin. But it marked the start of the enormous diffusion of *-ismo, -isme*, etc. in the modern languages. On the other hand, Greek prefixes and suffixes were often linked to words of Greek origin (for example, *a-, eu-, epi-, cata-*) and only gradually became freed (mainly the suffixes). Nevertheless, Latin contained a lesser proportion of Greek elements than the European languages today: it only provided the model, the starting point, as it were, for these languages to develop.

This is the Graeco-Latin I have been referring to, which displayed syntactic features similar or identical to those of Greek and, above

all, a lexicon that was already to a large extent common to the two languages. This mixed Latin, which began to spread at the end of Antiquity and to which Christianity also contributed, served as the vehicle of transmission of the intellectual vocabulary of Greek during the Middle Ages in the West, despite the fact that this language was practically ignored at the time. Later on, in the fifteenth century, both languages once again converged in the West, so that Graeco-Latin grew and continued to develop within the languages of Europe.

We should remember that Graeco-Latin was not just an educated and ecclesiastical phenomenon. In the same way that in the archaic period a series of borrowings came from the spoken language, so it was in the later period. In studies on vulgar Latin, such as that by Grandgent 1928, it is said to contain Hellenisms such as *amygdalum, cata* 'each', *colaphus, dactylus*; the verbal suffix *-izare*, already cited; adjectival suffixes such as -ος -η, -ον (> *-us -a, -um*) and, in particular, nouns adapted to Latin: -ας *(lampa)*, -ης, -της *(tructa, boletus)*, -ι *(piper, sinapsis/sinape, gumma/gummis/gummi)*, -ις *(pausa)*, -μα *(cima)*, -ρος *(Alexander)*, -ων *(leo)*. Sometimes, the starting point is a case other than the N. *(elephantus, magida)* or phonetic alterations are introduced *(ceresus, cithera, scopulus, spatula)*.

302. But we need to pay closer attention to the influence of Greek syntax on Latin to which we have already referred on several occasions. This influence was to be expected given the contact between both nations and the fact that the development of Latin literature on the Greek models called for the development in the former of the syntax as well as the lexicon.

The fact is that the oldest surveys of Greek syntactic influence on Latin were followed by more restrictive ones – too restrictive, in my view. Strange prejudices emerged; for instance, if a construction was present in Cicero, then this proved that it was Latin.

Not many Hellenisms are referred to in the treatises on Latin syntax: some in classical prose and in particular in classical poetry. For example, *quod mihi uolenti est* (Sallustius, Livius, Tacitus), cf. Gr. τοῦτό ἐστιν ἐμοὶ βουλομένῳ; partitives G. and others related, such as *dea dearum* (Ennius), *opportuna moenium* (Livius), *cuncta curarum* (Tacitus); Ac. of relation as in *traiectus lora, sacra comas* (Virgil); Ac. of the whole and a part (*Deiphobum tibiam ferit*, Dictys Cretensis); part. equivalent to a subordinate (*sensit medios delapsus in hostes*, Virgil); G. dependent of a verb as in *regnauit populorum* (Horace), also with *gratulator, gaudeo,*

miror, etc.; G. absolute, as in *eius praeteriti temporis (Bellum Hispaniense)* and of time, as in *huius temporis* (Jerome); *ille* as art., as in *ille mortuus* (*Itala*); inf. of preterite with aoristic value, as in *insidiam non timuisse debet* (Tibullus); inf. dependent on the adjective, as in *concedere digna* (Catullus); inf. clauses with ellipsis of subject and predicated in N., as in *uxor inuicti Iouis esse nescis* (Horace). The abundance of periphrastic forms of the verb in late Latin has been attributed to Greek influence.

In short, sometimes we are dealing with 'literary' and poetic constructions and sometimes with vulgar and late constructions.

303. The influence on phrase construction in general is more important. For example, the construction of verbs of understanding and language with *quod*, which is frequent in Plautus (*scio iam, filius quod amet meus istanc meretricem* in *Asin.* 52–53), only appears later in 'incorrect' passages of the *Bellum Hispaniense* (36: *renuntiaueront quod*...) or Justin (I 7, 9 *cognito quod*...), but much later it was normal in vulgar Latin and has passed into the Romance languages. The conclusion that can be drawn is that a 'submerged' construction became non-literary. This, no doubt, was a result of Greek influence, which imposed the generalisation of the subordinate with infinitive, also possible in Latin from the very beginning.

Yet, this is but a minor detail. Although the same cannot be said for the creation of the complex period based on subordinates and determinations of these, as imitated by Cicero from the Greek orators (Isocrates, Demosthenes) and subsequently practiced by the orators and throughout prose. As stated by W. Kroll 1935, p. 33:

> I am not speaking of Greek influence in the construction of discourse and of the Latin period, which, through this, obtained a clear and lucid form for the first time. We can appreciate the form that the language of the old laws and the Umbrian tablets used to have. Varro always preserved something of this burden. The great service provided by Cicero consists in that he completely rid himself of this.

Kroll also compares the transformation of German prose (or any European prose, for that matter) through Latin influence from the fourteenth century onwards.

Classical Greek syntax remained very much alive in Latin and, today, in our languages.

9. Greek and other languages of antiquity

The languages revolving around Greek

304. Latin was, of course, the language which was most influenced by Greek and which was largely responsible for introducing the language and culture of the Greeks to the Middle Ages and, indeed, modernity. But Greek influence was not limited to Latin: we have discussed its contact with the languages of Gaul and Hispania, with Etruscan, Demotic and Coptic of Egypt, with the languages of the Balkans, Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine. Most of these languages disappeared precisely because of the impact of Greek (or Latin, for others).

Indeed, within the limits of the Roman empire, only Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic survived; also Coptic in Egypt, which at some point was reduced to a sacred language. Subsequently, at the end of the Roman empire, Armenian and Syriac created a literature, as did, much later, Gothic and Slavic – always under the influence of Greek.

Greek did not manage to impose itself in Egypt, for Egyptian (Demotic at this point, but later called Coptic) continued to be the language of the masses. It also managed to influence Greek, as already discussed. There existed a bilingualism, as attested by the famous Rosetta Stone.

However, Demotic was in turn enormously influenced by Greek. W. Clarysse 1987 links 96 Greek words to Demotic texts: particularly honorific titles, proper names, official titles, administrative terms (especially from the sphere of finance) and objects of everyday life.

This influence increased from the moment in which, beginning in the second century AD, Demotic began to be written in Greek characters, first in local magical texts. This language is referred to as Coptic. From the year 300 onwards, translations into Coptic were produced of Biblical, Gnostic and Manichean texts – always from Greek, which increased its influence. It has been calculated that up to 20 percent of the Coptic lexicon is of Greek origin, adapted to this language. The morphology was also adapted: for example, there were changes in gender, according to Greek synonyms of the nouns. Also, compounds and derivates were created which did not correspond with the normal use in Coptic, and new meanings to some words were introduced though Greek borrowings. There were also syntactic influences.

305. I have already discussed how various languages of the Balkans (Thracian), Syria and Asia Minor (Phrygian, Phoenician, Lydian, Lycian, etc.) were subjected to Greek influence and began to disappear in different periods, at the very latest during the Roman empire. This entire region was for a time bilingual: numerous bilingual inscriptions have survived.

However, according to Strabo, the majority of the languages of N. W. Asia Minor had died out in his lifetime; the same can be said of other languages, such as Phoenician, which survived until the first century AD, in Cyprus until the second century. There are bilingual inscriptions and others, such as that from Piraeus dating around 96 BC, which are a calque of the Greek.

Aramaic as well as Greek was spoken in Syria and Palestine: this is seen in Babatha's archive, dated AD 132. Palmyra was multilingual: the higher class spoke Greek and Aramaic, others also Arabic. Here we find decrees in Aramaic and Greek, with Aramaicisms (N. for Ac., etc.). There are also decrees in Greek, Latin and Palmyric (Aramaic). Greek was also written, in a very altered form, in Dura Europos, in the Euphrates.

Given such circumstances, it is not strange to find Greek influence in the rare examples we have of these languages, which soon died out; for example, in Phrygia, κακουν in sepulchral inscriptions.

However, this influence is best demonstrated in rabbinic Hebrew, studied by X. Sznol 1989 based upon the works of S. Krauss, H. B. Rosén, D. Sperber and others, cited in the bibliography, in addition to his own study of the rabbinical text *Genesis Rabba* (Galilee, third to fifth century AD). The sources of these texts can be found in other writings in Hebrew and Aramaic, from the destruction of the second temple to the Byzantine period.

There are many lexical borrowings from Greek: terms relating to everyday life, trade, public administration and the military, religious and philosophical currents. These words are common in *koine* and are also found in Egypt, Syria and Asia Minor. To mention a few: ἀναλογή 'bill, receipt', λοιπάς 'added tax', φιάλη, ποτήριον. There are also new words: ἀντικαῖσαρ, δειγματήριον, διφέρνιον, and new formations: κεραμίδα, πρώτατα, ἄρχοντας (of the Ac. pl.).

306. Apart from the languages which gradually died out in Antiquity and those which survived, albeit rather precariously, such as Aramaic and Coptic, we should not forget the languages which began to be written towards the end of the Imperial period: from the third

century AD (Ethiopic) or the fourth century (Syriac, Armenian). This is significant, for up until then, these were languages without writing (although Syriac is actually a derivative of Aramaic) even though they were spoken early remote Antiquity. Galatan, spoken in Asia Minor in the third century BC, has left neither inscriptions nor writings.

All these languages began to be written as a result of diverse kinds of contact with the Greeks and Greek culture. For Ethiopic we have inscriptions in the kingdom of Aksum from the third century AD, inscriptions in Ethiopic and Arabic, but also in Greek. We are told that the emperor Zoskales, at the start of the century, was an expert in Greek. Another emperor, from the fourth century, Ezana, converted his people to Christianity and introduced vowels, according to the Greek model, into the former alphabet, introduced from Saba in Yemen. Towards the year 500 the Bible was translated from Greek and there was a volume of literature which borrowed many words from Greek, of the type *nōtāw(ə)* < ναύτης, *wangēl* < εὐαγγέλιον, *zōmō* < ζωμός, etc.

We have examples of Syriac from the second century AD, and it produced an entire literature from the fourth century AD, coinciding with its Christianisation. This was initiated by the bishop Ephraim, the great writer who wrote commentaries to the Bible and other apologetic works. A very important Syriac literature developed, largely translated from Greek; Syriac was also the intermediate language between original Pahlavi texts and the Greek language (as in the case of Syntipas) and also Arabic. This literature also included profane Greek works, starting with Aristotle. Once again, the forces of Hellenism together with those of Christianity initiated the conversion of a new language into writing.

Syriac is full of Greek words: *ʾeskēmā* < σχῆμα, *hjulē* < ὕλη, *ʾaksenjō* < ξενία, *ʾaftorō* < φθορά, etc.

The case of Armenian is somewhat similar, only here we are dealing with an Indo-European language whose alphabet was exactly adapted from the Greek. At the start of the fourth century, the Armenian king Tiridates III converted to Christianity and declared it the state religion before Rome did. A century later, the monk Mesrop invented an alphabet based on the Greek alphabet, with thirty-eight letters and very adapted to Armenian phonology: the purpose being to enable the Armenian people to follow the Christian liturgy. This invention was followed by translations of Christian writings by the same monk and many of his successors in the fifth cen-

tury. It is a fundamentally religious and historical literature, which was continued, in rather closely related dialects, until the middle of the nineteenth century; afterwards, it continued in modern dialects.

Numerous Greek borrowings were also introduced here, of the type *ayer* < ἀήρ, *argiuron* < ἀργύριον, *zom* < ζεῦγμα, *rawdos* < ῥάβδος; and some through Pahlavi. There were also borrowings from Greek syntax.

These were the peoples who emerged and established new cultures in the old territory of the Roman empire and its border zones. The influence of Greek on the Iranian language of the Parthians and Sāsānians should also be added, as well as that of the Celts, after the first contacts with the Greeks in Marseille and the colonies of Hispania. In effect, we have some seventy Gallic inscriptions in the Greek alphabet from the third century BC onwards (along with many *ostraca*). Cf. P.-Y. Lambert 1994, p. 81 ff.

See § 109 for the Iberian inscriptions in the Greek alphabet and the creation of alphabets and semi-alphabets, based on the Greek model, to record Iberian, Tartessian, and Celtiberian. Here we go back in time again, for most of these inscriptions date from the fourth century BC onwards.

307. On Demotic and Coptic, cf. A. Böhling 1960, W. Clarysse 1987 and V. Bubeník 1989, pp. 257–64. On other languages, cf. E. Lüddekens in Neumann-Untersteiner 1980, pp. 241–65, V. Bubeník 1989, pp. 264–83. For Palestine, see H. B. Rosén 1963 and 1980, D. Sperber 1984, S. Krauss 1898 and X. Sznol 1989. Also, for other languages, see the different sections in E. Schwyzer 1939, p. 161 ff. and F. Villar 1996. For Ethiopic, see F. Altheim–R. Stiehl, I, 1971, pp. 393–473. For Armenian, A. Thumb 1916 and A. Meillet 1936, p. 8 ff.

Germanic, Slavic and Arabic

308. At the close of Antiquity, the peoples who invaded the ancient Roman and Byzantine empire became the protagonists of the new era: Germans, Slavs and Arabs. They were all influenced in some way or another by the Greek language.

I will not attempt to examine the consequences of the pressure exerted by the Germanic tribes on the Mediterranean world (the invasions of the Cimbrians and Teutonics), from the second century BC onwards, but I think it is useful to look briefly at the Goths. These Germanic tribes, which had established themselves next to the Dnieper, clashed with the Romans in the third century AD (with the

incursions into Maesia and Thessalonika, the defeat against Aurelian). Subsequently divided into Visigoths and Ostrogoths, the former invaded various Roman provinces, especially in the West, but also made treaties with the Romans (under Constantine), and became their allies in the East.

The turning point was the Christianisation of the Goths, who converted to Arianism, and the translation of the Bible (which has not come down to us in a complete form) by the bishop Ulfilas, who came from a Christian family in Cappadocia and whose grandparents had been taken as prisoners by the Goths. Once again, the reason for translating the Bible was to enable people to become acquainted with the sacred writings in their own language.

For this purpose, Ulfilas created an alphabet of twenty-seven letters (nineteen Greek, six Latin and two runic letters). Of course, he also had to introduce some Greek words (*hairaísis* < αἵρεσις, *aikklesjo* < ἐκκλησία, *praisbytairein* < πρεσβυτήριον, etc.), as well as Greek syntax.

Nevertheless, the majority of the Germanic tribes pressed on into the West and were civilised and Christianised by the Western Roman empire, and by Latin. Therefore, Greek influence there was indirect.

Chronologically, the next invasion was by the Slavs. This Indo-European people, sometimes allied with alien tribes, came to the Danube from the N. and E. towards the year AD 500. At one point, they were allied with Byzantium against the Goths, but in the sixth century they began their incursions; in the seventh century they penetrated Greece, Thrace, and Macedonia. Yet, an important zone of the Byzantine empire did not definitively come under the Slavs: in turn, it received a very strong Greek influence (see more on this in §§ 379 ff.).

309. But the great catastrophe for the Byzantine empire (and later for the West) was the Arab invasion in 632: in a very short period of time it managed to occupy Palestine, Syria and Egypt, as well as Persia, part of India, Roman Africa and Spain. Under the attack of the Umayyad dynasty the Byzantine empire collapsed, except for Asia Minor and the European continent, which was under Turkish attack from the eleventh century onwards, culminating in the conquest of Constantinople in 1453.

Nevertheless, the Arabs were from the outset strongly influenced by Byzantine civilisation and received many borrowings from the Greek language. We will look at this subject in §§ 383 ff.

In addition, there was Greek influence on Nubian: Greek words in the inscriptions of the Cathedral of Faras (in the tenth century). Cf. M. Krause 1971 (citing K. Michaelowski 1938).

310. Thus, the Slavs were definitely the first – followed by the Armenians and, later, other peoples of Asia and, above all, the Arabs from the seventh century onwards – to reduce the extent of the the Byzantine empire and, consequently, of the Greek language. Later, in the eleventh century, the Turks would conquer almost all of Anatolia, and a large part of the Balkans in the fourtheenth century.

But all this was to a certain extent compensated for by the partial Hellenisation of the languages of these peoples, which extended to regions very distant from Byzantium: in the case of the Slavs to the whole of Eastern Europe, and in the case of the Arabs and Turks to vast dominions. In 1453, as mentioned above, Constantinople fell to the Turks, although some Byzantine cities and places remained which were gradually lost, such as Trebizond and later Crete.

However, Greek led a rather subterranean existence during the Turkish domination, a circumstance which favoured its diffusion as the language of the newly liberated Greece at the start of the nineteenth century. We must examine this.

Byzantium defended Europe in the East for some time, then it retreated; and it defended the Greek language, which was preserved, although in a reduced area, more or less that of ancient Greece. But Greek managed to have an enormous influence in Europe, especially through Hellenised Latin: this will be examined in the following pages.

CHAPTER TWO

BYZANTINE GREEK AND ITS INFLUENCE ON OTHER LANGUAGES

1. Historical context of Greek in Byzantium

Historical data

311. We have referred to the linguistic situation in the Eastern Roman empire before and after the great historical events from the fourth century onwards: the adoption of Christianity by Constantine and the proclamation of the freedom of cults (324), the transfer of the capital of the empire to Byzantium (330); the prohibition of pagan cults by Theodosius (394); the division of the empire (395); the sack of Rome by Alaric (510); and the closure of the Academy of Athens by Justinian (529).

Greek was now de facto the official language of the Eastern Roman empire, which in a few years became the last remaining Roman empire: the Byzantines referred to themselves as 'Roman'. We have seen how Latin maintained a symbolic role for a time, and then practically died out, being barely left as the language of jurists.

The Greek Church also became independent in practice, the schism of the ninth century having been foreseen for quite a long time. It had adopted Atticist Greek as its language, while popular *koine* continued to be spoken in the streets in an increasingly altered form. In this way, a situation of diglossia was inherited, which has continued, indeed, until the present day.

312. Greek was now the common language of the Byzantine empire, strongly centralised around Constantinople. It was also the language of the Church. This was a consequence of an imperceptible transition, which had started a long time before.

Yet there was an internal problem, that of diglossia. In theory, the situation was similar to that in the West (Latin confronted with national languages), but in pratice, the strong centralisation of Byzantium and the prestige of the empire and the Church reduced the popular language to the subliterary level for a long time, and truly

new literary works were not created in this language until the twelfth century; even then, only in marginal genres and always mixed with the literary language. The western risk of dialectal fragmentation was absent. True Modern Greek did not emerge until the nineteenth century as a unitary language.

On the other hand, there were terrible swings – retreats, reconquests, new retreats – which have already been discussed and which culminated in the sack of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, which forced Greek into a subterranean existence until independence and international recognition in 1830. Greek, as we have seen, disappeared first from the West and then from the territories conquered by the Slavs and Arabs, and later by the Turks. Let us examine this in more detail.

313. The period of the western barbaric invasions had its counterpart in the East with the Gothic invasions, from the fourth to the sixth centuries AD: from the defeat of Adrianople to the Gothic kingdom of Theodoric and the final destruction of the Ostrogoths in 536. But at least there was a favourable result: the Christianisation of the Goths and the creation of their writing based on Greek, as discussed earlier.

The last date falls within the rule of Justinian (527–65), who reconquered vast territories in Italy, North Africa, and Spain for the empire. He consolidated Byzantine culture, something which Theodosius II (408–50) had gone a long way towards achieving by reorganising the Academy of Athens, with chairs of Greek and Latin (Choeroboscus, who wrote on Greek grammar, was a titular there in the time of Justinian). Roman law was codified (the *Corpus Theosianum* and *Corpus Iuris*) and the whole culture became founded on Christianity and the study of the Greek classics.

The Roman empire experienced a rebirth, with the Greek and Christian cultures as its foundations. Of course, Atticist Greek dominated. Justinian was decisive: he brought the pride back to the empire and reorganised its culture. The Cathedral of Hagia Sophia was a symbol of this and served as an inspiration and example in the bad times to come.

314. Indeed, a new series of misfortunes were to come. The Slavs, united with the Avars, a Turkish people (and later assimilated by them), crossed the Danube around 500 and clashed with Justinian in 558. Later on, they went on to plunder the Balkans, founded

their own kingdom in Bulgaria (with the khan Kubrat, in 581), occupied territories around Thessalonika and the Peloponnese and besieged Constantinople (626). This at least had the virtue of expanding Greek culture to the Slavic world, which we shall discuss.

Another focus of tension was in the East, where the Persian Sāsānians were making terrible incursions into the empire: Khosrow I conquered Antioch (540), which was then reconquered by Belisarius; Khosrow II conquered Syria, Palestine, and Egypt and threatened Constantinople (615); in the end, he was defeated by the emperor Heraclius (627). Here, we are fortunate that asylum was given to the Greek thinkers who had fled when Justinian closed the Academy of Athens, and that Greek literature arrived in Persia by way of the Syriac translators of Edessa.

From the time of Justinian, the empire had been in a constant state of alert and had been weakening, which was fatal on the eve of the Arab invasion. It could not count on any help from the West. Byzantium was even more weakened by the religious conflicts within Christendom inherited from the past: the Monophysites were powerful in Egypt and Syria, the Nestorians here, and all were opposed to the orthodoxy of the Nicene creed, which had been adopted by Constantinople after much hesitation.

All of this will be outlined so that we can gain a better understanding of the cultural decline during these centuries. The great codes in parchment ceased to be written, those that remained being left to gather dust in the libraries until the ninth century, when they began to be copied in the new minuscule. Also, literature was barely produced (we shall return to this).

315. All of the previous problems and fears materialised with the Arab invasions: in 634, Bosra, the capital of Arabia, fell; the great defeat at the river Yarmuk, in Palestine, occurred in 636; Damascus fell in that same year; Jerusalem and Antioch fell in 638; Mesopotamia in 639; and Alexandria in 646. Meanwhile, the Arabs conquered Cyrenaica and Tripolitania, Rhodes, Cos, and Chios and launched annual incursions into Asia Minor, where they conquered numerous cities, such as Cyzicus and Smyrna. They managed an attack on Constantinople in 674. In addition, Spain and Italy were lost. Byzantium was reduced to little more than the limits of ancient Greece. But it never renounced its past: in the ninth century it initiated a reconquest and cultural renaissance at the same time.

However, in the meantime, cultural circumstances remained unfavourable. From the beginning of the eighth century, various emperors had joined the ranks of those calling for the prohibition of the cult of images. Adorers of images were persecuted and images were destroyed in the churches, until 843, when the cult of images was finally restored. This marked the start of the Byzantine cultural renaissance, around the Patriarch Photius. But, until that time, these unfortunate events did not favour literary production, which remained just as stagnant as before.

Popular and higher literature until 1453

316. Let us quickly review literary and subliterary production in these centuries.

For the first period, until the tenth century, few texts are available, some of which reflect the popular language to some extent, though always mixed with the literary language. This was accompanied by the more formal and literary language of, for example, Procopius, Paul the Silentiary, Ioannes Lydus, Agathias and Cosmas Indicopleustes in the sixth century, Theophylactus Simocattes and Georgios Pisides in the seventh century, John Damascene and Theophanes the Confessor in the eighth century.

Some examples of popular language have been preserved, such as the acclamations to the emperors in the Constantinople hippodrome, some of which contain satyrical traits such as that to the emperor Maurice in 602; as well as other short poems which are just as satyrical, for example, the poem to the empress Theophano in 970; and some which are simply erotic (the theme of the abandoned girl). In the seventh century there were also Proto-Bulgarian inscriptions, written in vulgar Greek and commissioned by the Bulgarian Khans.

This is all subliterary. An example of sixth-century literature containing vulgarisms is the chronicle of John Malalas ('the rhetorician'), a Hellenised Syrian whose attempt to write a history in the vulgar language was soon abandoned. But we must also mention the *Paschal Chronicle* in the sixth century, the *Pratum Spirituale* by John Moschus in the seventh century, the *Breviarium* by the Patriarch Nicephorus in the eighth century, the *Chronology* by Theophanes and the *Chronicle* by George the Monk in the ninth century, as well as the lives of the saints (Saint John the Charitable, ca. 630, and Saint Philaretos, in the ninth century).

I would like to add a text that is not mentioned in the histories of Byzantine literature: the collection of Aesopic fables called the Vindobonensis (after a manuscript from Vienna) and the versifications of the Bodleian Paraphrasis of the included in the same manuscripts.

There is also a certain popular air in Leo the Wise (886–912) and Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (emperor from 944). Yet, we should stress that these are not texts written in popular Greek, for such texts did not emerge until the eleventh or twelfth century, and even then mixed with literary Greek.

317. The main problem with this literature is dating the stages of the language. For, indeed, most of the popular characteristics it displays are found already in papyri, inscriptions, and texts from the Hellenistic and Roman periods. It is difficult to know when they were actually diffused, and whether the literary characteristics which are mixed with the popular in our texts were also mixed in the language of the street, or whether we are dealing with contaminations by semi-educated writers. For, evidently, the representatives of the truly popular language did not write.

318. For the Byzantine history, see, in particular, A. A. Vasiliev 1946, G. Ostrogorsky 1984, J. M. Hussey (ed.) 1996. For the literature, K. Krumbacher, 2nd ed., 1897, H.-G. Beck 1971, S. Impellizeri 1975, H. Hunger 1978b, I. Sevčenko 1982, U. Albini–E. V. Maltese 1984 (introductions), L. Politis 1994 and J. A. Moreno Jurado 1997 (introductions); also, S. A. Tovar 1990, p. 41 ff. For the older literature, of a vulgar type, cf. J. M. Egea 1987a (with more detail than is here provided, cf. p. 268 ff.) and 1990 (*Anthology*), P. Bádenas 1985b (edition of the *Acclamations*), V. Ursing 1930 (on the Vindobonensis fables) and K. Weierholt 1963 (on Malalas). In general, see G. Horrocks 1997, p. 179 ff.

319. Great events occurred in Byzantium in the ninth century. Under Michael III (842–67), Cyril and Methodius preached in Moravia and in 865, king Boris of Bulgaria was baptised, ushering in the Hellenisation of the Slavs, which we have already discussed. And after the victory over the emir of Melitene (863), a Byzantine offensive was launched in Asia, which continued under the Macedonian dynasty (867–1056); it was initiated by Basil I (867–886).

There were successes and reconquests in Italy (Benevento, Bari), in the islands (Crete), and in Asia (Aleppo, Cilicia, Syria). Under Basil II (976–1025), Bulgaria was transformed into a Byzantine province, and there was an advance on Asia, followed by the conquest of Armenia.

On the other hand, under the Patriarch Photius, Byzantine separated from Rome (867) and Photius himself, together with other scholars (the bishop Aretas of Caesarea in particular, in the ninth-tenth centuries) initiated the great Byzantine renaissance, which led to the proliferation of writings in the literary language (*katharevusa*). The ancient manuscripts were copied in the new minuscule, and a literature emerged which was derived from the ancient Greek (Photius, Constantinos VII Porphyrogenitus, Ioannis Kameniatis, the Accursiana collection of Aesopic fables) – always in the literary language, as stated.

From the time of Photius, a reorganisation of learning had been under way which culminated in the schools of Law and Philosophy founded by Constantine IX (the first, in 1046). We also know of a patriarchal school in the twelfth century. The prelates and large convents favoured the production of copies and the study of the ancient writings, as well as intellectual work. This movement involved persons in the court itself or protected by it.

However, under the next dynasty, that of the Ducas (1059–78), decadence set in with the great defeat of Manzikert, which opened Asia Minor to the Seldjuq Turks: once again, Byzantium was left to defend itself. Nevertheless, the Comneni (1081–1185) undertook a hard struggle to defend the empire in Asia, with setbacks such as the rights they had to cede to the Venetians, the start of the Crusades (in 1096), and the defeat of the emperor Manuel in Myriocephalon against the Seldjuqs (1176). This laid the groundwork for the greatest defeat of all: the conquest of Constantinople by the fourth Crusade, in 1204.

320. Such dangerous times were splendid for the Byzantine culture. The Atticist language had the advantage: united with Byzantine patriotism and the Church, it was diffused from the court of Constantinople as though it were a symbol of its majesty. This was a reaction against so many Barbarian attacks, the dispersion of the empire, and provincialism. It was also an honorific title that linked Byzantium not only with Rome but also with ancient Greece.

With the start, already summarised, of the literary renaissance in the ninth and tenth centuries, it was history in particular that flourished (in the eleventh and twelfth centuries): Scylitzes, Psellus, Kekaumenos, Bryennius, Anna Comnena, Eustathius, Nicetas Choniates; but also philosophy (Psellus), erudition (Eustathius) and the genres that were

translated or derived from the East: the translation of the *Panchatantra* in the eleventh century (by Simeon Seth), of the *Syntipas* in the twelfth century (by Andreopoulus), etc.

The remarkable thing is that under the Comneni a truly popular literature emerged for the very first time, even though it was mixed with characteristics of the literary language and had some special characteristics of its own. This popular literature was reduced to marginal genres that cultivated satire, didactics and fantasy. Its popular characteristics were not so different from those of the earlier period, as we shall see in more detail. But the problem remains of indicating to what extent this mixture of which we speak was a response to aspects of the spoken language and to what extent it was a result of artificial contamination. Furthermore, the differences between the different authors must be attributed to literary, not chronological, reasons. Indeed, the copyists tended to introduce forms of literary Greek.

321. The popular literature we are referring to in the eleventh and twelfth centuries consisted fundamentally of:

(a) Border poetry – the fight between the Byzantines and Arabs on the Euphrates border – documented in the ninth century by Aretas and represented, among others, by the eleventh and twelfth century poems of *The Death of Digenís, The Sons of Andronicus, The Song of Armuris, Porphyris and Digenís Akritas* (El Escorial manuscript).

(b) Various poems – the 'Prodromic poems' by Theodore Pródromus or Ptochopródromus, on the themes of beggary and satire, using the contrast between the two types of language; the poem by Michael Glycas, who defends himself, attacks and pleads from prison; the so-called *Spanéas*, containing advice to the prince; the *Judgement of the Fruit*; and poems of animal epics inspired by the West.

322. For more details, see the works cited by H.-G. Beck, p. 48 ff., R. Browning 1983, p. 72 ff., J. M. Egea 1987a, p. 269 ff. (and the *Anthology* of 1990, p. 44 ff.). See also J. M. Egea 1987b (explanation of the weight of classical tradition on the language of Constantinople) and 1990–91 (explanation of the literary character of the historiography of the Comnenian period); and P. Bádenas 1985a, p. 7 ff. For the *Digenís* see the edition of M. Castillo Didier 1984. Note that the authors of this 'popular' literature were erudite and sometimes also wrote literature in the Atticist language (Prodromus and Glycas).

323. Pressure from the crusades began to be felt towards the end of the eleventh century, and in 1176 the defeat suffered by Manuel I in Myriocephalon placed the Byzantines in a very bad positon in Asia Minor. This culminated in the conquest of Constantinople, in 1203 and later in 1204 under the Angelus dynasty, by the Franks of the Fourth Crusade aided by the Venetians. Earlier, the latter along with the Genovese and various western communities had settled in the coastal cities where they had a commanding influence over trade.

All this was decisive for the history of Byzantium and, indeed, for the history of the Greek language. The Latin kingdom of Thessalonika was founded, and the Venetians seized the islands of the Aegean, Ionia and Crete, among other areas; Richard the Lion-Heart in turn seized power in Cyprus, and the Hospitallers took in Rhodes. The Franks controlled the Peloponnese. Meanwhile, the Greeks created successor states in Epirus (with the Angelus dynasty), in Nicaea (N. E. Asia Minor, with the Lascaris dynasty) and in Trezibond (along the Black Sea, with the Comnenos dynasty).

In Asia Minor, the situation of Byzantium was precarious, for the different Greek dominions had been left isolated. In spite of everything, a deep-rooted belief in the value of Hellenism had remained very much alive, so that the repeated attempts to unite the Greek Church with the Latin Church were destined to fail.

324. However, things were never the same again, despite the reconquest of Constantinople in 1261 and the political and cultural restoration that came with the Palaeologus dynasty. Once Constantinople and later Thessalonika had been liberated, the Franks of the Villehardouin family continued to control the Peloponnese (now called Morea) and the Lusignans, Cyprus; and towards the end of the thirteenth century, the Catalan Almogávares founded the duchies of Athens and Neopatra.

Around this time, the Turks disembarked in Europe: in 1354 they conquered Gallipoli and after the battle of Kosovo (1389), Serbia and later Bulgaria fell under their control.

325. In fact, at one point, only the regions of Constantinople and Thessalonika (until their fall in 1430) continued under the dependency of the emperor; whatever remained of the Greek language in Asia Minor and Italy was left isolated, which favoured dialectal fragmentation (the dialects which have been preserved come from these regions).

The influence of the western languages on the Greek language (especially in the lexicon) was significant; western literature also exerted an influence, providing models for the new Greek literature (the chronicle, novel, and erotic poetry). But the principal model was provided by the 'vulgar' western languages with a literary use, which, through imitation, stimulated a similar phenomenon in Greece.

And yet, with the Palaeologi, in the two centuries from the recovery of Constantinople to its definitive fall in the hands of the Turks (1453), literary cultivation was significant in the region that was still free.

Indeed, for the (official) Atticist language we can cite, in Nicaea, Nicephorus Blemmides, George Pachymeres and George Acropolites; in Constantinople, the scholars of Nicaea when the capital was liberated, and others such as John Cantacuzenus, Alexius Macrembolites, Ducas, etc. But, above all, the copying of ancient manuscripts was resumed: at a certain point, in minuscule and paper, which made them cheaper and thus easier to diffuse. On the other hand, monastic schools emerged, such as those in which Planudes, Nicephorus Gregoras and Michael Apostolius, among others, taught. There was also a series of learned men, some of whom moved to Italy after the city was taken, where they brought their manuscripts, and continued to teach.

326. This was important for the preservation and transmission of ancient Greek. But for the understanding of popular Modern Greek from the twelfth century onwards, the new literature that used it is essential, however mixed it may have been with Atticist Greek. I have described the reasons for the appearance of this literature: the isolation of certain regions which were under western power, and the western model of popular literature and some of its genres.

Perhaps the first written text in a generally popular language is the Chronicle of the Morea, dating from around 1300, which is a narrative of the conquest by the Franks from a favourable point of view; it was probably the work of a Frank or a descendent of one. Although it was written in Byzantine political verses and reproduces Byzantine formulas, it is actually a western epic poem written in a cross between the popular and Atticist language. For more details, see J. M. Egea 1988, p. 11 ff.

Prose documents such as the Assizes (feudal laws of Cyprus) also have a western base, along with other chronicles, such as that of Cyprus by Machaeras, those of Ducas, Monemvasia, and Tochos.

The Cyprus chronicles (the one already cited and some later ones) were written in a dialect of that island.

But we must refer in particular to the knightly poems of an erotic type, true novels containing echoes of the Greek novel but with additions of a western type. They date from the fourteenth century and among them we can cite *Lybistros and Rhodamne*, *Callimachus and Chrysorrhoe*, *Belthandros and Chrysantza*, etc. These are the most well-known works. There are also historical songs and threnodies, a translation of the *Iliad* into Byzantine Greek, fabulistic poems (*The Book of Birds*, *of the Quadrupeds*, etc.), love songs, religious and moral poetry, satires, etc.

It is remarkable how the western occupation, by isolating certain Greek territories from the great cultural centre of Constantinople and providing them with other models, contributed – but only to a certain extent – to the liberation of the popular Greek language from the dominion of Atticism (although always in marginal genres, as in the previous period).

There is some doubt about whether one ought to speak of Byzantine Greek or Modern Greek: I have chosen to reserve the latter term for the national language after the liberation.

Literature from 1453

327. The occupation of Constantinople in 1453 (and subsequently that of Trebizond in 1461, and Lesbos in 1462) represented a brutal shock at a time when the principal characteristics of Modern Greek were already present, but there hardly existed any literature in this language outside the marginal zones and genres, and always with a linguistic mix. To be sure, once the empire was left without its head and without an imperial court, this situation in principle favoured the emergence of a new literature; but other circumstances were not favourable to this.

In the zone occupied by the Turks, culture was in the hands of the clerics who lived according to the old tradition; if they wrote, it was in the Atticist language. Moreover, the Patriarchy of Constantinople and the idea of a lost empire that had to be recovered was preserved. Nevertheless, oral poetry did exist although we know very little about it; for instance, the klephtic ballads which narrate the adventures of the bandits who fought against the Turks in the mountains. Little else remains. The popular language gives the impression of having been well established, although it did take certain lexical

borrowings from the Turkish language, which also borrowed from Greek.

328. Now, as previously mentioned, there were indeed some territories that were, at least for a time, free from the power of the Turks. Here, western power, generally Venetian, was much more tolerable. A new literature took root. It serves to be reminded that Rhodes was in the hands of the Hospitallers until 1522; Nauplia and Monemvasia were in the hands of the Venetians until 1540, Crete until 1569, Cyprus from 1489 to 1566. Also, the islands of Ionia and the Greek regions of Italy never fell into the hands of the Turks.

It is in these territories that the new literature took root. In Cyprus, besides the chronicles already mentioned, such as that by Machaeras, there were also love poems in the style of Petrarch in an almost pure Cyprian dialect (sixteenth century), and also in Rhodes (*The Alphabet of Love, Love Trial*).

But it was above all in Crete where new literature emerged: the poem by Manuel Sclavos on the earthquake of 1504, a series of tragedies (*Erophile, The Sacrifice of Abraham*, etc.) and comedies (*Katzurbos, Stakis, Fortunato*), the narrative poem *Erotokritos*, the bucolic *The Beautiful Shepherdess*, etc. Some of these works are by well-known authors: Cuortatzis, who died in 1610, wrote *Katzurbos* and *Erophile*; Foscolos wrote *Fortunato* (1660); Kornaros wrote *The Sacrifice of Abraham* and *Erotokritos* (1635 or later). Sometimes their books were printed in Venice and circulated in the continent. The dialect used was Cretan, with purist forms.

In these works we encounter, for the first time, and with few interferences from the literary language, a post-Byzantine Greek which is almost Modern Greek.

The Ionic islands also produced popular literature. Sometimes, these works were translations; although there was also a tradition that remained alive and was continued by the poet Solomos. Corfu produced the first Greek grammar, by Nikolaos Sophianos. It was written in Venice towards the year 1540, but remained unpublished until 1870.

These are the foundations upon which Modern Greek would emerge as the national language, see §§ 417 ff.

329. See the works by R. Browning 1983, p. 69 ff., 88 ff., J. M. Egea 1987a, p. 270 ff. and 1990 (introduction), P. Bádenas 1985a, p. 5 ff. For the Chronicle of the Morea, cf. J. M. Egea 1988; for the novel *Callimachus*

and Chrysorrhoe, P. Apostolopoulos 1984. For the literature, see the references in § 318. For the literature of Crete, Rhodes and Cyprus, see P. Stavrianopoulou (ed.) 1996, with an edition and translation of the texts.

It should be noted that Byzantine literature developed almost without the influence of Latin literature. In highly sophisticated authors we find quotations from Latin authors and references to a few translations, almost always by later and medieval authors, and mostly of a juridicial or theological type. It was only in the fourteenth century, largely through the work of Maximus Planudes, that many Latin classics were translated. Nevertheless, from the thirteenth century onwards, but particularly in the fourteenth century, many Latin and French novelistic texts were translated: for example, the Latin novel about Apollonius King of Tyros, the French *Gyron le Courtois* (from the Arthur cycle), Boccaccio, the fables of Reynard the Fox, the novel *Flora and Blancaflora* (Tuscan version), etc. Cf. A. Lumpe 1970 and Adrados 1979–87, II, p. 704 ff. of the english edition. All of this (along with the direct knowledge of French and Italian literature) had a great influence on Byzantine literature and facilitated the entry of a lexicon from western languages, as we shall see further in §§ 362 ff. But this together with the Turkish lexicon entered mainly by means of human contact, from the period of the Crusades onwards.

2. Description of Byzantine popular Greek

Phonetics and morphology (until the eleventh century)

330. We can identify a first phase, from the sixth to the eleventh century. But let us not forget that many of its characteristics were already present in the Greek of the Hellenistic or Roman periods; that they cannot be dated within this period, with few exceptions, although it cannot be excluded that some which are documented in the later period already existed in this period; and that the true differences between the few popular texts available to us consist in the proportion of the always present mixture of popular terms and literary or Atticist terms. For this reason, the description that follows is an abstraction, based upon the 'popular' forms which appear alongside the literary forms and hypercorrections.

331. The vocalic system of *koine* – with its lack of distinction of quantity, iotacism, elimination of diphthongs and its six vowels – remained intact until, in the tenth century, υ (that is, *ü*) was pronounced *i*, with which the shift was made to a system of five vowels which is still current. But initial atonal vowels, with the exception of ἀ-, were dropped (as in σπίτι 'house', μέρα 'day', ῥωτῶ 'I ask',

μάτι 'eye', ψάρι 'fish', etc.). Yet, through an influence of the Atticist language, ἐλευθερία and λευτερία, for example, were restored. This led to the loss, on occasion, of atonal augment.

As regards the consonants, the fricativisation of voiced occlusive and aspirated voiceless was generalised, as well as the simplification of geminates (with hypercorrections such as πολλύς in Malalas) and the loss of -ν (except before a vowel). The latter phenomena did not reach all of the dialects.

332. As regards the noun, we must point out the definitive loss of the D. (except in formulas such as δόξα τῷ Θεῷ and in Atticisms): in its place, we have Ac., G., or εἰς + Ac. (ηὔξατο τὸν θεόν, εἶπεν αὐτοῦ). Three systems dominate (in the sg.) for the N., G., and Ac. cases, all with stems ending in a vowel. In the first system, the old masc. in -ας entered, as well as part of the old third declension; in the second, the old feminines in -α and another part of the third declension; in the third, the old 2nd declension:

1. N. πολίτης, πατέρας, βασιλέας
   Ac. πολίτην, πατέραν, βασιλέαν
   G. πολίτη, πατέρα, βασιλέα
2. N. πόρτα, πόλη, Ἑλλάδα
   Ac. πόρταν, πόλην, Ἑλλάδαν
   G. πόρτας, πόλης, Ἑλλάδας
3. N. λόγος
   Ac. λόγον
   G. λόγου

With the loss of the -ν, types 1 and 2 were left with two forms. On the other hand, some residues of the old consonantal system remained: γένος/γένους, σῶμα/σώματος, etc. There was also a tendency to modify stems using -ος in masc., -η in fem. (ὁ ψῆφος, ἡ παρθένη). In the adjective, those with two desinences in -ος, -ον now had three (-ος, -η, -ον).

All of this (as well as changes in gender or stem) is connected with analogous processes and with the simplification of the declension, which had the tendency to reduce the stems to two and to generalise the Ac. as a dependent of the verb and the G. of the noun, a process which was already under way in the Hellenistic period.

In the plural, we also find the types mentioned, on three stems. Notable examples are the N. in -ες in the systems 1 and 2 (πατέρες,

χῶρες but also still χῶραι), and those in -άδες, -ίδες (καφέδες, παπποῦδες, on φυγάδες, δακτυλίδες).

333. The article and pronoun present a very different case, resulting in part from the preceding period. For instance:

Article: fem. pl. N. οἱ; Ac. τές.
Personals: along with the old forms, in the sg. we find hypercharacterisations and in the pl., equivalences with the sg.: 1st Ac. ἐμέ, ἐμέν, ἐμένα, ἐμέναν; 2nd N. ἐσύ; Ac. ἐσέ, ἐσέν, ἐσένα, ἐσέναν; G. ἐσοῦ; pl. 1st N. ἐμεῖς; Ac. ἐμᾶς, μᾶς; G. ἐμῶν, μῶν; 2nd N. ἐσεῖς, σεῖς; Ac. ἐσᾶς, σᾶς; G. ἐσῶν, σῶν. Also, there are atonal forms μας, σας. For the 3rd, an atonal form was created τον, την, το, etc., derived from αὐτός.
Demonstratives: ὅδε disappears, αὐτός is replaced by ἴδιος, ἰδικός, the stem τουτ- is generalised in οὗτος.
Relatives: ὅς tends to be replaced by ὅστις, and by the interrogative τίς, τί; also, by ὅπου, ὁποῖος.

334. The most important thing with regard to the verb is the following. In the present, verbs in -μι disappear and the following stems are widely diffused: -ίζω, -άζω, -εύω, -νω, -νῶ, -άρω: for example, there is φέρνω, κερνῶ, ἀφίνω. By analogy, there is κρύβω, κλέβω. With these presents there is a tendency to create a system of two stems, insofar as the aorist and perfect are confused or mixed: ἔποικας, ἀπώλεκας, etc. The normal system thus becomes that of ἀφίνω/ἄφησα, ψήνω/ἔψησα, etc.

The system of the middle voice is also dropped, while that of the passive voice develops. In the latter, forms of the type φέρθηκα impose themselves.

For the future tense, ἔχω + inf. is normally used; other periphrases are also diffused. On the other hand, augment is in decline, as mentioned earlier, as well as reduplication.

The system of desinences innovates, but with a confused mixture with the previous system. We can point out the middle inflection of εἰμί (εἶμαι, εἶσαι . . .), with a 3rd sg. ἔνι, the old adverb later being written as εἶναι. The mixtures of old and modern desinences referred to are frequent (3rd pl. pres. -ουν/-ουσι, aor. -αν/-ον, etc.).

Yet, with the loss of the optative and, in part, the subjunctive (with a short vowel it became identical to the indicative), the infinitive and participle are in decline. The former survives, but tends to

become reduced to certain constructions: the Vindobonensis collection of fables mostly eliminates the infinitives of the completive clauses of the Augustana, its model. The participle is used in a confused way, with errors of gender and construction: ἀλώπεκα . . . δελεάσασα, Ἥλιος . . . προξενοῦντα (which anticipates the later indeclinable participle in -ντα[ς]).

Examples of popular texts

335. It is useful to make some observations on prepositions and conjunctions (με for μετά, ὡσάν, ξε-, ξανα-, στόν etc.); and the great advances in certain suffixes such as -ίτζιν, -ᾶτος, as well as the new lexicon. This will be discussed in more detail in §§ 352 ff.

With regard to syntax, we must stress the frequent substitution of the subordinates by coordinates with καὶ.

For clarification, it may be useful to provide examples of the Greek of some of these texts (I will not deal with phonetics and orthography).

336. *Acclamations of the stadium and other small poems.* Anomalous forms are in the minority:

> *Lexicon*: ἀμόνι 'anvil', γεράκι 'falcon', μοῦλα 'mule', σέλλα 'chair', ὅλος for πᾶς, στήκουσι.
> *Nominal inflection*: N. ἀλεκτόριν, γεράκιν, Μαυρίκις; Ac. γοῦναν.
> *Anomalous form*: δέρμαν, hypercorrected.
> *Lack of augment*: φέρε, νόησες.
> *Pronoun*: enclitic του, το, την, relative ὅπου. Prepositions: στόν, εἰσέ (contamination of the old form with the new form σέ).

337. *Proto-Bulgarian inscriptions.* The same observation applies here.

> *Lexicon*: γυρεύω 'to search', λαός 'army', ὅλος, καλά adv.
> *Prepositions*: ἀπό + Ac., ἀνάμεσα, ἐπί = ἕως, ἕως + Ac., ἔσωθεν, ἰς + Ac. = 'in', μέ.
> *Nominal inflection*: Ac. βασιλέαν. *Verbal*: pres. εἶν(αι), subj. = ind. ἵνα . . . ὑπομνήσκετε, ἤνα διαμίνουσι (with fut. value), aor. ἐφτάστισαν (with -σθ- > -στ-).
> *Parataxis* to avoid the inf.: ἔδοκεν (perf. for aor., but there is also δόσας), κὲ ἐρήμοσεν (without augment).

338. Malalas. Colloquial and paratactic style, but Byzantinisms are rare: inflection is almost always classical, but see, for example:

Lexicon: λοιπόν 'onwards', πιάσαι 'to catch', ῥῆγα (Ac.) 'king', ἰλλούστριος, etc.
Prepositions: εἰς τὸν ἀέρα 'in' and the hypercorrection ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις 'towards'.
Relative: abundant use of ὅστις for ὅς.
Verbal inflection: ἀλυτάρχησαν without augment, aor. εἰρεκώς, periphrastic perf. ἦν προτρεψάμενος, μέμψας ἦν pas. v. ἐπαύθη.
Various constructions: ὠφείλων + inf. with fut. value, ἔδοξεν . . . ὁ βασιλεύς, final construction πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, ἡσύχασεν . . . τοῦ ποιεῖν ταραχάς, ἀπό (agent).

339. *Fables from the Vindobonensis collection and the Bodleian paraphrasis*. Most vulgarisms can be found in these fables, from the sixth and seventh centuries. I follow the study by Ursing on the Moscow codex:

Nominal inflection: Ac. sg. of the 3rd φλόγαν, πόδαν, N. pl. of the 1st θύρες, ἀγρότες; forms of the 2nd decl. in words which were originally of the 3rd: ὀρνίθοις, δελφίνου; changes in gender. In the adjective, the use of the comparative with the same value as the positive.
Pronouns. The article as a relative, equivalent αὐτοῦ and αὑτοῦ, possessive ἴδιος.
Verbal inflection: lack of augment in ὀρχοῦντο, πεπώκειν; id. of reduplication in ἀναπετασμέναι; perfect for aorist, and pluperfect for perfect (εἰς τοὺς βρόχους ἐπεπτώκει).
Prepositions and conjunctions: ἀπό + Ac., ἅμα + G., interchange of ἐν/εἰς; ἵνα τί, ἐάν + ind., μέχρις, ἕως + ἄν and ind.
Syntax: anomalous Ac. (δέλτον σε ἔφερα, ἀπήντησεν αὐτόν, ἤκουσε παῖδα κλαυθμυρίζων); anomalous G: φυλάξομαί σου, ὅμοιον ἀνδρός; hypercorrect D.: τοῖς ἄλλοις ζηλοῦντες, ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτῷ; verbs of 'promise', etc. with present infinitive; final infinitive with article; avoidance of the inf. in completives with various constructions (παρῄνεσε . . . ὅπως . . ., λέγων ὅτι . . . ἀποδώσειν, ἕως ἄν . . . συνθλάσαι); anomalous uses of the participle, cf. § 334.

340. For more data see the references already cited, cf. §§ 318, 322, 329; and in G. Horrocks 1997, p. 205 ff. For the Vindobonensis, I insist on U. Ursing 1930: it is a shame that this area has escaped the attention of scholars studying the Byzantine language. But this is not all, for we still need to study, for example, the Byzantine corrections of the classics in the manuscripts of this period through the eleventh century.

Sometimes we are faced with difficulties. In the *Life of Aesop*, which I have studied (cf. Adrados 1993), we need to determine, firstly, whether we should correct in the Atticist sense as the editors do; and secondly, whether or not the non-Atticist terms of a manuscript such as the G (a Cryptoferrantensis of the tenth century) are Hellenistic or Byzantine.

Phonetics and morphology (from the twelfth to the fifteenth century)

341. Let us now turn to the next period, which dates from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. Vocalism is kept as it was at the end of the previous period, once υ has become *i*: it is a system of five vowels. In the consonants, the evolution κτ, χθ > χτ, πτ, φθ > φτ, σθ, σχ > σκ becomes dominant; but traditional orthography results in the preservation, alongside this, of old forms of the type ἄσχημος. Final -ν is dropped, a phenomenon begun earlier, which results in homophonous cases of the 1st and 2nd declension, with the presence of non-etymological extensions (we have seen some examples); -έα, -ία become -ιά (καρδιά). The geminates are simplified (but not in some dialects).

However, dialectal variations are known in this period, such as those preserving final -ν (in Cyprus, Dodecanese and Italy), those giving other treatments to the consonant groups (in southern Italy), those palatalising the κ before preceding vowels (in Cyprus), or closing the vowels *e*, *o*. We shall discuss these dialects further on (§§ 434 ff.) in connection with Modern Greek.

342. In nouns, the main difference, as noted earlier, is that with the loss of -ν, the N. and Ac. of the fem. of the 1st declension became identical (N. Ac. χώρα/G. χώρας) and the same applies to the Ac. and G. of the masc. (N. κλέφτης/Ac. G. κλέφτη). The rest stays the same, including the remnants of declensions in -ος/-ους, -μα/-ματος, -ις/-εως, plurals in -άδες, -ίδες, adjectives with three desinences (those in -ης/-ες and others had to adapt in various ways); there are also other regularisations such as μέλανος, μεγάλος.

343. The subjunctive, which as we know is constructed on two stems, ends up being assimilated to the indicative, and the participle becomes indeclinable in -οντα(ς).

The future is marked by the periphrasis with which we are already familiar, with ἔχω + infinitive or ἔχω νά + subjunctive; εἶχα in the

same constructions is potential. Nevertheless, with the advance of the period, there is preference for periphrasis with θέλω + infinitive, θέλω νά + sunjunctive, the previous ones passing into the perfect (ἔχω) and pluperfect (εἶχα); in the *Chronicle of the Morea*, we come across both uses, as well as the periphrasis with θέλω (from which the modern future with θά is obtained). In twelfth-century Cyprus we find θέ.

There is a large variety of personal desinences. In the 3rd pl. we find the present -ουν(ε)/-ουσι, pret. -αν(ε)/-ασι, -σαν. Contracted conjugations have developed, which in the active voice sometimes confuse the old forms in -άω and -έω, while in the middle voice we find both φοβοῦμαι, φοβᾶσαι, φοβᾶται and forms with -ίεμαι, -ίεσαι, -ίεται. In the middle voice (or the deponents), we find new forms alongside the traditional: -ούμουν, -ούσουν, -όταν, -όμεστα, -έστε, -ούνταν.

In verbs with accent on the last syllable an imperfect is created, -οῦσα, etc. and -αγα, etc. The desinence of passive aorist -θην is replaced definitively by -θηκα. In the imperative, the desinence -ε of the present extends to the aorist.

344. Pronouns systematise the new forms, for example, N. pl. ἐμεῖς. Similarly with prepositions. Here, with the generalisation of the use with Ac., the old distinctions in meaning between prep. + Ac./prep. + D. disappear: με(τά) + Ac. is 'with' ('after' is ὕστερ' ἀπό); ἐν + D. is replaced by μέσα εἰς. Other prepositions either disappear or are retained as sophisticated words (ἀνά, ἐπί, κατά, περί, πρό, πρός, σύν, ὑπέρ, ὑπό).

The vocabulary also evolves, as a result of borrowings from Turkish and the western languages, as well as internal developments (derivation, composition, semantic change). This subject will be dealt with in another chapter.

345. Looking back at ancient Greek and Indo-European, we find that we now encounter a very different language which nevertheless retains traces of its inheritance. In phonetics, the vocalic system is formed by the five vowels *a, e, i, o, u,* without diphthongs; the consonantal system is formed by a system of voiceless and voiced occlusives with three points of articulation and a system of voiceless and voiced fricatives with the same three points of articulation; with the liquids and nasals ρ, λ, μ, ν; and a voiceless and voiced sibilant (written ζ). I will not deal with compound consonants.

Nominal inflection has been simplified: the D. is lost and the Ac. and G. tend to have well-defined general functions; they can, for

instance, be used as determinants of the verb or noun. The gender of old Greek (diffused in the adjective in a regular morphological manner) has been maintained, as well as the sg. and pl. numbers (the old dual was lost much earlier). Formally, there is a predominance of vowel stems, which frequently adopt the same form for the N. and Ac. or the Ac. and G., as mentioned. The adjective has taken forms that are analogous to those of the noun. In the desinences, there are also analogous generalisations. But exceptions remain in form and content.

The article and pronoun are essentially the same, with differences which are almost invariably of a formal nature. For instance, we find the extension of the sg. to the pl. stem of the personals; new demonstratives, invariably based on the old three stages, and new possessives of the 3rd pers.; a tendency for various kinds of elimination of the old relative. There are also changes in inflection. The creation of atonal personals of the 3rd pers. is newer, enabling the creation in Modern Greek of an objective conjugation which is similar to the Spanish (of the type *'se lo dire todo a tu madre'*).

346. In the verb, there is a reduction of the present stems and a fusion of aorist and perfect, which form a second stem. The future and perfect are now expressed with periphrastic forms. In the moods of the verb, with the early loss of the optative, the subjunctive, identified with the indicative, is now lost, and also the participle, transformed into an indeclinable adverbial form; at the end of this period the infinitive is at the point of being lost.

So, the marking of tense is reduced to the opposition of present/preterite and to the indicative; the other tenses and the subjunctive are expressed by atemporal periphrases of a subjective kind. But the aspect of present and aorist is kept very much alive, even being carried outside the indicative.

We are dealing with a simplified Greek, which partly follows tendencies that are similar to those in the IE that we call IIIB (polythematic IE of the European languages and Tocharian), which reduces verbal inflection to two stems and regularises it significantly, almost eliminating athematic inflection; and which also reduces the moods, the participle and infinitive a little, and makes abundant use of periphrasis for the future and perfect.

Sometimes the new Greek resembles a certain branch of IE: for instance, with respect to details of verbal inflection (such as the cre-

ation of a new imperfect and others referred to earlier) and nominal inflection (such as the loss of the D. and the creation of inflections with only two stems). There is a parallel for the loss of the infinitive in Balkan languages such as Rumanian and Bulgarian.

347. Consequently, the tendencies of *koine* are carried on into Byzantine Greek, in that the latter simplifies verbal morphology, which is only used to mark three persons, two numbers, two tenses (in ind.) and two aspects. The older Greek system was evidently far too refined and complex, and so it was reduced and complemented with periphrastic forms. This also applies to the noun and adjective. Yet it survived, and the rich system of nominal and verbal derivation and composition continued to develop.

It is useful to provide, as we did for the Greek of the previous period, examples of the language of some of the representative authors of this period. We will look at texts in which there is a contamination of the two levels of Greek. Pure, or almost pure, popular Greek is found in the popular poems dated between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries, mentioned above in § 328.

Examples of popular texts

348. *Prodromus.* See the beginning of the verses to the emperor Manuel. Some, expressly addressed to the emperor (141–44), are in a purely literary language; in the rest, there is sporadic literary language. For example, we find D. γεροντικοῖς, πατρικοῖς, λόγοις Ac. γείτονα, impf. περιεπάτει, aor. ἔμαθον, pas. aor. ἐκτενίσθη, impv. πείσθητι, μετά and ἐκ + G., ἀπὸ μικρόθεν, οὐδέν, ἔκβαλλε, some infinitives in -ειν, etc.

But there is also an abundance of modern elements: for example, in the lexicon (βλέπω 'see', γεμᾶτα 'full', γυρεύω 'search', τσαγγάρης 'shoemaker; τώρα 'now', ὡσάν 'how', the suffixes -ίτσιος, -ᾶτος). In the noun, there is a frequent use of N.-Ac. in -ιν (παιδίν), Ac. γυναῖκαν (and erroneously -ν in ἀναθέμαν). There is also a frequent use of enclitics: του (ὁ κόλπος του, ποτέ του) and τον (βλέπεις τον), the relative ὅπου, and the pers. ἐσένα. The accusative of anomalous syntax is very frequent (ὑπέρπυρα γέμει, ἀπ' ἐκεῖνα). In the verb, there are new forms of the present (ἀπλώνω, χορταίνω), the aorist-perfect (ἔποικαν, ηὕρισκα), the subjunctive, which is identical to the indicative (παραθέσουσι, νίψεται), the indicative of εἰμί (ἔνι). Above all, there is abundant periphrasis with νά + subjunctive with values

of prospective, future (νὰ τὸν εἴπω, νὰ ὀνομάσουν, νὰ μάθῃς), or present (πρὸς τὸ νὰ μάθω γράμματα).

349. *Digenis Akritas*. It is sufficient to look at the first verses of the poem in the manuscript of El Escorial edited by Castillo Didier. The first impression is of an entirely classical text: for example, we have a N. pl. ἀπειλαί, Ac. sg. κατάραν, pl. πληγάς, old verbal forms such as μὴ φοβηθῇς, prep. + G. παρὰ μητρός, etc. But there is modern lexicon (ἐκαβαλίκευσεν, with old inflection, ἀστερᾶτον with the familiar suffix, ἀργυροτσάπωτα, a hybrid form). In the noun, the diminutives χέρια, ὀνύχια (from which we obtain the forms of Modern Greek), μετώπιν. In the pronoun, we find μᾶς and the enclitics του, την. In the verb, the new subjunctive καταπτοήσουν (with a classical construction, μὴ σὲ, in the first verse); it also appears with ἂς and ἂν with a prospective or future value (καὶ τότε ἂς τὴν ἐπάρουν, ὁ Θεὸς νὰ μᾶς βοηθήσῃ).

We could continue. A few verses further on we come across ὀμπρός εἶν(αι), ἠθέλασιν, ἐμπῆκαν, ὡσάν, relative τάς, οἱ ψυχές, etc.

350. *Chronicle of the Morea*. Here, we can refer to the study by J. M. Egea 1988. We need only look at the beginning of the poem to appreciate the same mixture. In the first two lines, we find old elements indisolubly linked with the new elements: θέλω, θέλεις + subjunctive, ὅταν + imperfect ἤτονε, ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου (a perfectly classical, ecclesiastical influence) but μὲ δύναμης (the modern form of the preposition and inflection). There is a modern use of prepositions in εἰς τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸν τάφο (with the loss of -ν), στὸν 'in'; and a modern use of the relative (ὅστις, ὅπου). The system of personal pronouns is almost that of Modern Greek. New verbal forms include, among others, imperfects such as ἀφεντεῦαν (Byzantine lexicon), ὕψωνεν, ἔρριπταν, τιμωροῦαν, the aorists ἔκλαψεν, ἐβαρέθηκεν (but ἐλυπήθην), the participle ἰδόντας; and, above all, very diverse and hesistant periphrastic uses.

In contrast, the stems of the future and perfect and the optative, among other things, have disappeared.

Indeed, it would seem that popular Greek dominates: Atticist forms are often the result of corrections in various manuscripts, and often the popular language is written with Atticist spelling, which makes it possible for us to discover Atticist forms in the phonetics as well as morphology.

From verse 754 onwards, there is a notable presence of false lit-

erary words and hypercorrections: the participles ἀκούσων, διαβόντα, Ac. θυγάτηρ; other forms are correct, such as ἐπάρωμεν, ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, βασιλεύς, τινές. Yet, alongside this we find modern forms such as βασιλέας, τοῦ ἔδωκεν σὲ γράφω, τηρήσετε, the pronoun ἐμᾶς/μας/μᾶς, ἂν φάγουσι, etc.

351. *Callimachus and Chrysorrhoe.* This novel brings us to the fourteenth century. The study of Ph. Apostolopoulos 1984 is very complete: here, we provide only a few data.

In the noun, we find αἱ ἡμέραι/αἱ ἡμέρες; παιδί/παιδάκι, χέρι, Ac. sg. γέρονταν, N. pl. οἱ τεχνῖται/οἱ ἀφθέντες (also Ac., alternating with -ας). We should note that the D. still appears with some frequency.

In the pronouns, we find all the forms we have already discussed, including the enclitic forms: μου, μας, του, τους (beside ἐμοῦ, ἡμῶν, etc.), the type ὁ ἰδικός μου 'mine', demonstrative αὐτός, etc.; archaic indefinites (τις, οὐδείς, παντοδαπός, πᾶς) beside the modern (κανείς, τίποτε). Similarly, we find classic relatives and ὁποῦ, in addition to the article (τοὺς φύλακας τοὺς εἶδε). The inflection of the two personals is quite classical, with ἡμεῖς, etc. and forms in D., but alongside ἐμέν and enclitic forms.

There is a significant advance in the frequent lack of augment. The imperfect ἔβλεπα and aorist 2nd pers. sg. ἔγραψες are generalised, along with the aorist imperative of the type γνώρισε, the aorists with -κ- such as ἐποῖκα, ἀφῆκα (but also ἄφησα); also, the forms of the middle voice of εἰμί. The system of desinences is quite conservative (but, λέγουν). The particles ἄς, ἄν, and periphrasis with ἔχω and ἐθέλω function normally but, curiously, very often with the old subjunctive (ἂς δράμωμεν). Furthermore, the infinitive (μὴ θέλῃς με πειράξαι) and the participle are retained, although with low frequency.

This novel displays a very mixed, rather archaising language—proof, once more, that chronology is not always the deciding factor.

3. The development of the Byzantine lexicon

352. It is useful to dedicate a separate chapter to the growth of the lexicon in Byzantine Greek; to be complemented by a further chapter in which, by describing the influence of Byzantine lexicon in the East and West, we may be able to shed some light on other data.

The fact is, since I have already paid special attention to the growth of the Greek lexicon – particularly of the educated language, in the Classical, Hellenistic and Roman periods – and since I intend to deal with its diffusion and growth in the West, it is impossible to leave this important intermediate stage untouched.

The facility of Greek to create new derived and compound words (see Adrados 1968) is a fundamental characteristic of this language, which continued to operate during the Byzantine period, while different parts of the grammar were innovating in a profound way. This did not mean that the old lexicon was preserved (though this did occur, particularly in Atticist or 'pure' prose) or that new words were introduced through borrowing or semantic variation, but the methods of derivation and composition, which were essentially the same, continued to expand the Byzantine lexicon.

The fact is that the Byzantine lexicon has never been systematically studied in its entirety, and we do not even possess complete dictionaries. Apart from the old lexicons, which are incomplete, by Stephanus, Sophocles, Dimitrakos, and Lampe (a partial work dedicated only to the patristic lexicon), we have to make do with contemporary works which are also incomplete: our *Greek-Spanish Dictionary* (*Diccionario Griego-Español*), which only goes upto the year 600), the Dictionary by Kriarás and that by Trapp-Hörandner-Diethart (apart from partial studies).

Indeed, the study of the Byzantine lexicon should deal with two very important issues: the borrowings it received from different languages, and its diffusion into different languages (sometimes diffusing words of non-Byzantine origin). All of this will be dealt with before we look at the diffusion of Graeco-Latin into western languages. For, although we cannot draw clear divisions, we can distinguish between Byzantine influence through a popular route, preferrably from an earlier date, and the influence of classical Greek (usually through Latin) through a literary route, particularly from the twelfth century onwards and even more so during the period of Humanism.

353. For a general overview of the matter in question, see E. Trapp 1988. For compounds and borrowings from Greek, see R. Browning 1983, pp. 67 ff.. and 84 ff., and 1997; and A. Steiner-Weber 1991. For the relation between the Atticist and popular lexicon, see Adrados 1948, p. 67 ff. For borrowings adopted by Byzantine Greek, see H. and R. Kahane 1970 ff. And 1979; also, L. Burgmann 1990 (Latin borrowings). Furthermore, see M. A. Triantaphylides 1909.

For French and Italian borrowings, cf. H. and R. Kahane 1970 ff., p. 501 ff.; for Turkish borrowings, see R. Browning 1983, p. 97 ff.

354. Nearly all of the suffixes of ancient Greek continued to be productive in Byzantium, but we should draw attention to suffixes which were either new or more frequent: -ᾶς, -σιμο, -μα, -ισσα, the diminutives -ιον, -άριον, -άδιον, -ίδιον, -άκιον, -ίκιον, the new suffix -τζι(ν), -ίτζι(ν), the Latin suffix -ᾶτος, those of Italian origin -ούτσι(ον), -ούτσικος; we have already pointed out which of the verbal suffixes are most frequent. Consequently, derivation was very smooth; an adjective could be obtained from practically every noun, as, for example Μανυηλᾶτος from Μανυήλ.

Composition was extremely rich. Although many old nominal compounds of the elevated language, disappear, as well as many verbs with prepositions, many new forms of all the traditional types were created.

Copulative compounds are present, such as ἀριστόδειπνον 'food and meal', ἀνδρόγυνος 'man and woman'; adjectival compounds such as βραχύμακρος 'short and long' (and βραχυμακρόβραχυς 'short, long and short'); determinative compounds of various kinds: γοργογλωττία 'great oratory skill', παγκλεής 'very glorious', ποντοβάμων 'which moves in Pontus', etc; θεόβλαστος 'born of God'; and possessives: ἀγριοπρόσωπος 'with a fierce expression'. There are also verbal compounds, with noun (μηροκλάζω 'to break a leg', σιδηροδέω 'to chain up') and with preverbs (καταπαγετέω 'to freeze', ὑποξαντίζω 'to die a light blond'); also, with double or triple preverb (ἐγκαθυπογράφω 'to sign in', παρεκεπιτείνω 'to extend even more'). Verbal compounds with the preverb ξανα- 'again' are frequent.

As I have stated throughout, Greek has preserved that marvellous trait which enables anyone to create a new word. Many of these new words are individual discoveries made by writers of the elevated language. The total numbers are very high and have not yet been properly calculated, cf. A. Steiner-Weber 1991, p. 245.

355. The new Byzantine lexicon represents to a large extent a renovation, in that the popular language, in particular, loses a substantial part of the old vocabulary. There is αἰσχρός and ἄσκημος, against ἄμορφος; οἶκος against σπίτι; καλός no longer refers to physical beauty, etc. There are innumerable examples. But classical words could continue to be used in the literary language. Consequently, we find doublets of the type βασιλεύς/βασιλιάς, used for stylistic purposes.

This subtle game is particularly well illustrated when a text is carried from one of the two main registers to the other. I have studied this in connection with the popular Byzantine collection of fables, the Vindobonensis, which rewrites its old model, the Augustana collection, which is a cross between an Atticistic and a poeticising language. I have studied the mechanism in Adrados 1948, p. 67 ff., and have shown how Attic and poetic terms are almost systematically substituted by terms which are common to *koine*, or rather, to popular and sometimes vulgar *koine*. The number of compound verbs with preverbs is reduced.

The stylistic study of the Byzantine texts is threfore rather complicated. Cf. for example, the study of the *Alexias* by Anna Comnena in E. Díaz Rolando 1989.

4. Borrowings in Byzantine Greek

Latin borrowings

356. The Byzantine lexicon also grew, as we have seen, by means of linguistic borrowings from peoples and cultures with which Byzantium had contact. Let us look at one people or culture at a time.

We have already discussed the Latin borrowings in East Greek in the first periods. It was pointed out how Latin only gradually ceased to be the official language and how knowledge of Latin literature in Byzantium was negligible. We also noted the huge importance of the trace it left in law.

H. Mihaescu 1993, p. 350 ff. has established that some 3,000 Latin terms entered Byzantine Greek, of which some 200 were retained in Modern Greek. Avoided by the educated, they were not of minor importance for the public; not just with regard to legal and administrative terminology but also military terminology.

In the legal and administrative fields it was inevitable that a great number of Latin terms would enter into translations and commentaries. There is a good study on this subject by L. Burgmann 1990. Sometimes, Latin terms in Latin letters were included, sometimes they were transcribed into Greek (of the type μαγκίπιουμ). Burgmann indicates that in the paraphrase of the *Institutiones*, some 1,000 Latin words appear, each one about ten times. They also appear in private and offficial documents.

It is clear that there were certain currents that sought to Hellenise

the legal texts. At times, authors limited themselves to altering the Latin terms, adapting them to Greek inflection (ἀδοπτεύειν) or else glossing them; while other times, they translated or calqued them. However, many words from the legal language were carried into the popular language; for instance, ποσσεσίων, ἀκκεπτιλατίων 'receipt', τεσταμέντον, ἐξερεδατεύω, ἐμαγκιπατεύω λιτιγάτωρ, ποῖνα, μοδεράτωρ κηνσεύω, etc.

Now, the creation of Greek terms from Latin was important in the popular language from the start of the Byzantine period: it was the continuation of the process which we have studied for the Republican and Imperial Roman periods. Given the rather limited influence of Latin literature in Byzantium, it was the popular language that exerted the most influence and not the elevated language (with the exception, as we know, of the legal and administrative vocabulary). This popular language created words which in many cases were reexported to the West: occasionally, they display specific phonetic or morphological alterations; indeed, there are even mixed 'monsters' (ἁπλοπάλλιον).

357. Let us quickly review the principal elements of this vocabulary:

Imperial court, titles, functionaries, professions: καῖσαρ, μάγιστρος, πατρίκιος, ὀφικιάλιος, κυέστωρ, πραιπόσιτος; ταβουλάριος, ληγάτος, βεστιοπράτης 'silk trader', μακελλάριος, etc.
Military: see in particular H. Mihaescu 1993, who examines the Greek terms of Latin origin relating to uniform and equipment (κάππα, καλίγα, τέντα), transport (καβαλλικεύω, σέλλα), weaponry (ἀρμάτος, ἀρκάτος, σαγίττα, σπάθα), organisation (ὀρδινατίων, οὐετρανός, κουνίον, ἐξπεδῖτοι), vigilance (ἐξπλοράτωρ), ranks (πρῖμος, κορνικουλάριος), insignia (βηξίλλον, φλαμούλιον), strategy (κιρκεύειν, κουρσάτωρ), rewards and punishment (ἀδωρέα, δησέρτωρ), signals (βούκινον, πραίκων), settlements and fortifications (κάστρα, ἀγέστα), means of communication (στρᾶτα), etc.
Daily life: κομμέρκιον, νοῦμμος, οὐγκία, καλάνδαι, ἰούνιος; μεμβρανάριος, βρακάριος, βανιάτωρ, ταβελλίων, ὀστιάριος; ὀσπίτιον, σέλλα, φοῦρναξ, σκρίνιον, βάκλον, μακελλάριον; καμίσιον, σαγίον, βράκιον.
The world of the circus: the hippodrome played a fundamental role in Byzantine life and had its own vocabulary, nearly always taken from the Latin. Cf., for example, the seats of places reserved for the emperor and magistrates (σένζον < *sessus*, σελλίον,

τέντα); carts, flags, crowds (βῆγα, πανίν 'team insignia', βηλάριν 'flag to signal the start', φακτίων, ὄρνα 'urn for drawing lots', αὐριγάριν 'tunic of the *auriga*', λουπέρκαλ 'end of the year race', φακτιονάριος 'president of a circus team', μαξιλλάριος 'he who puts the cushions on the seats').

358. We could easily go on. Clearly, part of this vocabulary was lost, along with the institutions it served; but another part survived into Modern Greek. On the other hand, form and meaning in this vocabulary are at times Latin, while other times there is derivation (particularly with -ᾶτος) or semantic change. In addition to the previous examples, we can point to others such as τρούλλα 'cupula' (from Lat. *trulla* 'serving spoon'), σκάλα 'port' (Lat. 'stair'), μῶλος (from Lat. *moles*), καλαμάριον 'inkpot' (from Lat. *calamarium* 'writing reeds case'), etc.

It should also be noted that derivation can be from the Ac. (δούκας from Ac. δοῦκα, in turn, from Lat, *ducem*); in the first two declensions we cannot see whether they originate in the N. or the Ac. Also, modifications in form can be more profound than the mere addition of a suffix: sometimes the new word becomes semi-Greek, like κένταρχος (for *centenarius*), δίσεκτος (for *bisextus*). The original Latin can also turn out to be hypothetical; for instance, καλαφάτης must come from a **calefa(c)tor*, but this remains a hypothesis. Sometimes, the original Latin comes from the spoken Latin of the Balkans, as for instance πετζιμέντον (*impedimentum*), with fricativisation. Cf. H. Mihaescu 1993, p. 354.

Borrowings from Gothic and eastern languages

359. Let us now look at the much rarer borrowings from other languages.

For instance, borrowings from Pahlavi, the Persian language of the Sāsānian period, given that the contact between the two peoples was, as we know, intense (mostly of a bellicose nature but also cultural). The Byzantines succeeded the Romans as defendors of the Euphrates frontier, suffering terrible invasions in Syria and Palestine, and achieving great victories under the emperor Heraclius, on the eve of the Arab expansion. This conflict weakened both peoples and left them defenseless before the new conquerors. But there was also an important cultural exchange, as reflected in the Greek influence on Sāsānian art and the spread of Manicheanism to both sides of

the border. Greek literature merged with the Pahlavi literatures of the Persians, which had been previously influenced by the Greeks: the Sāsānian court had welcomed Greek philosophers who had emigrated when Justinian closed the Academy of Athens (529), such as Simplicius, as we noted previously; and Greek elements entered into Pahlavi versions of the *'Panchatantra*, such as that which, through Arabic, served as the base for the Castilian *Calila and Dimna*. I have dealt with this elsewhere (cf. for example, Adrados 1983b).

Consequently, we find Greek borrowings in Pahlavi and Pahlavi borrowings in Greek. Among these, we can cite *ινδανικόν (mid. Lat. *andanicum* 'a type of steel'), from *hindawáni* 'Indian'; χιβιάριον 'caviar', from *kapi* 'fish' and *ya* 'egg' (?).

360. As regards the Goths, we have discussed their conflicts with the Byzantine empire as well as the Ostrogothic empire of Theodoric. The eastern Goths had received Christianity (in its Arrian sect) from the Greeks and were very Hellenised. It was in the Greek East that the Gothic bishop Ulfilas or Wulfilas created Gothic writing based on Greek and translated the Bible into Gothic, as mentioned previously.

The Gr. πουγγίον (attested in the sixth century and even in the dialects of today), from the Goth. *puggs* 'bag', was also carried into Rumanian. Yet the main influence was in the opposite direction. The same occurs in the case of Slavic, which had a very close belic, but also cultural, relationship with Byzantium, as we have seen. I will explore this subject when I discuss Greek borrowings in Slavic.

361. In the case of Arabic, in contrast, lexical borrowings occurred in two directions, and, frequently, those which Greek received from Arabic were later re-exported in various directions. In general, it could be said that Arabic borrowings in Greek result from relations at the popular level from the time of the Arab conquests that we have referred to; whereas the borrowings which the Arabs took from the Greek result from relations at the literary as well as popular level. But this subject will not be dealt with now. I will limit myself here to a few observations on Arabic borrowings in Greek, which sometimes later re-exported them, as mentioned.

There are very concrete examples of terms from military and political life, or relating to plants and animals. For instance, we have *amir*, which became Gr. ἀμιρᾶς with various derivatives, *rizq* 'that which Providence provides', from which Gr. ῥιζικόν (and from this

Sp. *riesgo*, etc.) was obtained; *targaman*, from which δραγομάνος with many derivatives was obtained; *badingan*, from which Gr. μελιντζάνα (and from this Sp. *berenjena*, etc.) was obtained; *babga*, from which Gr. παπαγᾶς (Sp. *papagayo*, etc.) was obtained.

Borrowings from western languages

362. Let us now turn to the borrowings from western languages, which was the product of a history that is already familiar to us. There were relations with Italy early on, but the oldest relations with the Byzantine Italy of Justinian did not result in Italian borrowings, only Latin ones. Then, from the eleventh century, Venice, Genoa, Amalfi, and other cities established close relations with Byzantium, where there were colonies of their citizens; there was also a Venetian dominion in Crete and other parts, and Turkish conquests in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, to which I have already referred.

Furthermore, the Franks passed through Byzantium from the end of the eleventh century onwards as crusaders, conquered the city, and when they later lost it, remained there as 'lords' of the Peloponnese and Cyprus. In the fourteenth century it was the turn of the Catalans and Aragons. I have referred to the Turkish conquests in the Balkans in the fourteenth century, the sack of Constantinople and later the Byzantine cities.

The Italians and French left their mark on Byzantine literature, as we mentioned earlier. Indeed, they even left a mark on the language. Greek contained borrowings from the Italian languages, from Provençal, French, Catalan, etc. but no longer from Latin.

363. Titles and feudal terminology, in particular, were taken from French: καβαλάρος 'knight', μισίρ 'lord', ῥόϊ 'king', μπαρούς 'baron', σιργέντης 'sergeant'; φιε = Fr. *fief*, παρλαμᾶς 'parliament', κουρτεσία 'courtesy'; κουγκεστίζω 'to conquer', etc. Also, military terms (κουγκέστα 'conquest', τρέβα 'truce'); and eccleciastical terms (πασσάτζο 'passage to the Holy Land', φρέ 'friar', παρτοῦν 'pardon').

In the Greek dialect of Cyprus, many French and Provençal words have been preserved: βαλλεντίζα 'bravery', κουρούνα 'crown', πλαζίριν 'pleasure', γαρεντιάζω 'to guarantee', τζιμμία 'chimney', ἀσίζα 'legal provision' (*asize*), etc.

364. Commercial and naval terms, in particular, were taken from Italian. In the oldest period, the naval lexicon had been carried over from the Greeks into Italy; but from the eleventh century onwards

(and later, the sixteenth century) the reverse was true; also, suffixes such as -ελλο, -εττο, -εσσα, -ῖνος were carried over. The majority are Venetian, but we shall not go into this now.

Among the old Italianisms, from the eleventh century onwards, we can cite: in the navy and in war, ποδότας < *pedotta*, τραμουντάνα < *tramontana*, πάτος < *palto*; in fashion and daily life: καππούτζιν < *cappuccio*, γρίζος < *gris*, κόντης < *conte*, μερκατάντος < *mercatante*, τζαμπούνα < *zampogna*.

There are numerous borrowings in the more recent Italian. For example: titles (δουκέσσα, ποδεστᾶς); public life (σάλβο 'safe-conduct', ντοάνα 'customs'); common terms (γράτζια 'grace', βε(ν)δέττα 'revenge', ἀβεντοῦρα 'adventure'); from religion (πῖος, φε, φέστα); cultural life, music, poetry (νοβέλα, βιόλα, τρουμβέτας, κρόνακα); fashion, professions (ῥάζον 'satin', βερέττα < *berretta*, ῥόδα 'wheel', μπρούνζινος 'bronze'); war, weaponry (γουβερναδόρος, περίκουλον, φορτέτζα, παντιέρα); etc.

Naval terms were particularly important: φόντος 'depth', ῥένα 'sand', ἀρμάδα, φούτα, ἀντένα, κουβέρτα, καπετάνος, etc.

Many of these words were carried into Modern Greek.

365. Finally, we must mention the Turkish borrowings, many of which have survived to the present day. For instance, παπούτσια 'shoes', πιλάφι 'rice', γιαούρτι 'yoghurt', καφές 'coffee', τουφέκι 'rifle'. We find -ογλου in the patronymics. Turkish influenced word order in the dialects of Asia Minor.

5. Greek borrowings in other languages

General ideas

366. We are now dealing with a decisive moment in the history of the Greek language. On the one hand, it continued to survive, as such, in Byzantium and from there into modern Greece, while on the other hand, it influenced and implanted itself into all the surrounding languages. This process has already been examined for the Hellenistic and Roman periods. In Rome, specifically, a type of Latin which we call Graeco-Latin was created. Enormous advances followed, so that Greek remains among us until today.

It should be noted that Greek penetrated our languages through multiple routes. Let us review a few of the observations we have already made:

(a) Through Byzantium, whether through contact between individuals and peoples or through a cultural and ecclesiastical route.
(b) Through the Latin that was kept alive in the Middle Ages as the language of culture, and which absorbed Greek terms from classical and especially late Latin.

367. Later on, classical Latin, which was progressively discovered and studied in the age of Humanism, became the source for extracting Hellenisms; in the fifteenth century too, they began to be directly extracted from the ancient Greek that was brought to Italy by scholars fleeing from the Turks.

It is not always easy to stick to this classification: Byzantine terms passed into Latin and the languages that were just starting to be written, but sometimes the entry of these predates Latin documentation. Very often, it is difficult to fix a date or route of entry for these Hellenisms. Yet, at a certain point, Greek roots and formative elements began to be freely used within the modern languages, once they had been fully incorporated into them.

At any rate, there are two fundamental routes. First, the route of medieval Greek and Latin (which shall be looked at in this chapter), consisting of Byzantine Greek and medieval, late Latin models. Second, the route consisting of classical Greek and Latin models (which shall be looked at in the next chapter). Indeed, with the arrival of the Renaissance and Humanism in the West there was a shift of perspective in the western perception of Greek culture: the old, classical phases of Greek and Latin now served as the model to follow.

It is paradoxical that the learned Byzantines, by taking refuge in Italy, would bring there classical Greece, which was much more appreciated by the West than contemporary Greece. A long time would pass before Byzantium and even the European Middle Ages would be studied and appreciated.

368. Yet, if we return to the end of Antiquity and the Middle Ages, Byzantium was the centre of the world, the true continuation of the Roman empire. Its literature, with the exceptions we shall give, was barely known in the West. But its State, Church, military organisation, art, and industries were imitated by all.

Indeed, it was a centre of the world which, with Justinian, occupied all the area extending from the Danube to the Euphrates and the Nile, in addition to North Africa and a good part of Italy and

Spain. Its influence did not diminish after the loss of the Byzantine possessions in Italy (the exarchate of Ravenna in the eighth century, Sicily in the ninth century, southern Italy in the eleventh century), Africa, and Spain (in the seventh century). Nor did it diminish after the successive conflicts with the Slavs and Arabs: only from the thirteenth century onwards did the current begin to change and western influence started to increase in Byzantium.

As the centre of the world and the greatest cultural and political authority, Byzantium – and with it the Greek language – exerted the greatest influence on the surrounding peoples, whether through force or diplomacy.

Who were these peoples? To the north, the Goths, and later the Slavs; to the east and south, together with those already mentioned, first the Sāsānians, then the Arabs, and later the Turks. Byzantium had a influence on all of them. Similarly, in the West, among the Latin, Germanic, and Celtic peoples.

I will examine the Greek borrowings received by the various languages of these peoples in the first half of the Middle Ages, until the thirteenth century: with this, I continue the parallel study which I began for the period of Antiquity. Then, I will examine the other area referred to, the influence of literary Greek in Europe, through the classics, from this same period in the thirteenth century.

However, before exploring the linguistic issue and Greek influence on these different languages, it will be useful to give an overview of the historical-cultural context. In this way, we will explore, successively, Greek borrowings through Latin; those that entered directly into the Romance languages; those that entered the Germanic languages (through Gothic); borrowings through Slavic and through Arabic (at times, the transmitter of borrowings into other languages). For each case I will give the historical context.

Borrowings in western languages

369. I will begin with the West. The Germanic emperors were primarily interested in being recognised by the emperors of Byzantium as emperors of the Romans, from Charlemagne to Otto III. They sought equality – as two emperors crowned by the Pope and the Patriarch – which the Byzantines had denied them, even though they did call the emperor of the West '*patricius*' or 'king' of the Romans.

The dream of unity remained alive: Charlemagne attempted to

wed the widow emperess Irene, Otto II married the princess Theophano, who gave birth to the emperor Otto III. But this was an impossible dream to realise, for when the power of the papacy became too strong, Byzantium's response was the Photian schism. This led not only to a political but also to a religious division.

The union was impossible, and the West knew very little about Byzantine culture, as the Byzantines in turn knew little about Latin culture. The Greek language was even less known in the West.

But Greek still had prestige, as attested by certain residues in the liturgy (the *Kyrie eleison*, the *trisagion*) and by the tradition of bilingual Bibles that were still being copied. Greek was better preserved by the Irish and English monks who were active in the court of Charlemagne, and later in France and the monasteries of St. Gall, Reichenau, and others. Also, by the Greek monks themselves, who were present in the court of Otto I, and were numerous in Rome in the eighth and ninth centuries, and even more so in southern Italy: first, as refugees from the Arab invasions, and later from the iconoclasts, they founded monasteries and cultivated Greek.

370. Translations, however, were not very numerous. The translations, particularly in Italy, of the lifes of the saints are from an early period. Later, Dionysius the Areopagite entered in favour, with translations of Hilduin (abbot of St. Denis) and Scotus Erigena in the eighth and ninth centuries. In the latter century, Anastasius translated hagiographic and ecclesiastical literature in Rome.

Some texts were translated in St. Gall (Hippocrates, Galen, Dositheus). Aristotle and others would have to wait until the twelfth century, with the translations by Aristippus, in Sicily, and Grosseteste, in England. In the thirteenth century, we have the translations of Guglielmus of Moerbecke and the Toledo school of translators, who worked from Arabic, as we know. Also, there was the Greek *Grammatica* by Roger Bacon, translations of Nicholas of Otranto, etc.

So, although Roger Bacon himself referred to the scant knowledge of Greek in Europe, and philosophers such as Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas studied the Greeks through Latin translations, there is no doubt that the Greek language had prestige. This prestige was linked to the prestige of Antiquity and of Byzantium itself, with which there was much contact in the councils and numerous embassies from the time of Charlemagne.

We should also note that the influence of Byzantine art was enor-

mous in Europe: in architecture, painting, textile, ivories. From at least the ninth century onwards, it served as a vehicle, not only for Greek literature, but also for Eastern art which was introduced into Europe through this route.

I have studied this subject in detail in connection with the fable, in Adrados 1984a. There is a Greek fable tradition, for instance, in one manuscript of St. Gall from the ninth century: the same monastery in which, around that period, Greek authors were being translated.

371. In fact, as we shall see, there are many Greek lexical borrowings dating from the medieval period. They may sometimes turn out to be Latinisations of Greek words that penetrated the new Romance and Germanic languages, but mostly the opposite seems true. There were various routes of entry: through cultural or personal contact in the West, or other routes through Byzantine Italy and the Arabs. At any rate, Latin was the language of culture and religion in the West: from here, the lexicon of Greek origin, together with the residual Latin lexicon, penetrated into the new languages of Europe.

372. For the historical relations between Byzantium and the West, in addition to the historical works already cited, see W. Berschin 1970 and S. A. Tovar 1990. For Byzantium as the transmitter of the fable tradition to the West, see Adrados 1984e. For borrowings in western languages, H. and R. Kahane 1970 ff., p. 349 ff., F. Brunot 1966, I, p. 121 ff., M. Cortelazzo 1970, A. Ewert s. a., p. 288 f., W. Stammler (ed.), 1957, p. 733 ff., K. M. Pope 1973, p. 30 ff., H. Lüdtke 1974, p. 160 ff., A. de la Cruz and A. Cañete 1992, p. 109 ff.; and, for Spain, M. Fernández-Galiano 1966 and J. Berguz 2002.

373. We shall now look at the influence of Byzantine Greek on the western languages. However, it is very difficult to dissociate this influence from that of the older borrowings: for example, if σύνοδος 'meeting of the bishops' is attested from the fourth century, it is difficult to decide whether Lat. *synodus* and its derivatives in the different western languages is from the same date or from the Byzantine period (the same applies for καμπή, ταρταροῦχος, ἐπιφάν[ε]ια, βούτυρον, etc.). Just as it is difficult, as we mentioned previously, to establish whether there was an intermediate Latin in Greek borrowings, or a direct link from Byzantine Greek to the modern languages, through one of these.

There is also the question of whether the borrowing is indeed popular or literary, and not strictly Byzantine: sometimes it is the

two, from *monasterium* we obtain popular as well as elevated derivatives (Sp. *monasterio*) in the western languages, and similarly with *ecclesia*, etc. Sometimes, from a single word we obtain a derivative through the Byzantine route and another through the normal Latin route: from ἀποθήκη we obtain Sp. *botica* (with Byzantine iotacism) and *bodega* (without it).

It would seem more appropriate here to provide actual Byzantine terms which infiltrated the West through Latin transcriptions (keeping in mind the doubt expressed in § 371).

Thus, I will provide a summary of actual Byzantine words (by date of appearance or by semantics) which infiltrated the western languages. They will be classified by date of appearance in Byzantium: the date of the Latin form may be contemporary to or posterior to this date (even anterior to our documentation of the Greek). Chronological groups will be established, and I will indicate whether the Latin term and, very briefly, the western forms are of interest. But we will only be dealing with a few examples.

374. In the following, I will indicate the date of the word's or the meaning's first appearance in Byzantium:

Fifth-sixth centuries: κανονικός, μάνδρα 'cloister', 'cell'; πρωτόκολλον 'first leaf of a roll of papyrus', λιτανεία 'litany', *τρισάγιον 'trisagion', ἑκτικός 'consumptive fever', κάραβος 'rapid boat', ἀπόδειξις 'receipt', ταξίδιον 'voyage'. The Latin transcriptions are attested in general, although in some cases they have to be reconstructed. As regards the derivatives in the Western languages, we need only refer to, for example, in Sp. *letanía, trisagio, hético, carabela*; in other languages, for example, OFr. *etique*, Port. *karavo*, Ital. *polizza* (from which we obtain Sp. *poliza*), Ital. *tasseggio*.

Seventh-eighth centuries: εἰκών 'image' (MLat. *icona*, eighth century), ἄρτος 'consecrated bread' (MLat. *artona*, seventh century), καλόγηρος 'monk' (MLat. *calogerus*), μουστάκιον, παλληκάριον 'young man'. See derivatives such as: Sp. *canónigo*, Cat. *calonge*, Ital. (dialects) *ancona, icona, cona*, Venet. *mostacci*, Sp. *mostacho*.

Ninth-tenth centuries: ναός 'temple', ῥωμαῖος 'pilgrim', συμφωνία 'musical instrument', περγαμηνή 'parchment', βάμβαξ 'cotton', λεῖμαξ 'snail', ἀμιρᾶς (MLat. *amiras*) 'admiral', βυζάντι(ον) 'a Byzantine coin', μακάρι 'perhaps', Σαρακηνός 'muslim' (before, 'Arab'), γαλέα 'small battle-ship', κοντούρα 'ship with a short tail', χώρα 'region' (MLat. *hora*), σκλάβος. There are derivatives, generally through Latin, such as

Sp. *nave*, Fr. *nef*; Sp. *romero, zampoña, parche, besante, maguer, sarraceno, galera, eslavo*; MFr. *amirail*, OItal. *saracino*, Venet. *gondola*.

Eleventh-twelfth centuries: παράδεισος 'paradise', χαριστεία 'scarcity', pl. ἀργαλεῖον (Lat. *argalia*) 'catheter', *βρόντιον 'bronze', κατάστιχον 'cadastre', δίμιτον 'a tissue', ἐξάμιτον 'another type of tissue', *ἀβροτάριχον (Lat. *butaricum*) 'salted fish', σκάλα 'port'. There are derivatives such as Ital. *paradiso*, Sp. *paraíso, carestía, bronce*, Ital. *algalia*, Fr. *algalie*, Venet. *catastico* (Sp. *catastro*), Ital. (dialects) *buter, boder* (Eng. *butter*), Sp. *botarga*, and *escala*.

Thirteenth-fourteenth centuries: *πρόχιον 'pitcher' (MLat. *broccus*), *πλήτρια 'funnel', μακαρώνεια 'funeral song' from 'funeral food'. From here, forms through Latin such as Ital. (dialects) *brocca*, OProv. *broc*, Ital. (dialects) *pledria, plera, plero*, Ital. *maccheroni*, Sp. *macarrones*, Ital. *arcipèlago*, Fr. *archipel*, Sp. *archipiélago*. Some words passed directly into French during the Crusades, such as *boutique, chaland, dromond*.

375. A few observations should be added to the above:

1. Byzantine phonetics appears frequently: Sp. *botica, pergamino, *limosina* (pressupposed for Opisan. *mozina*, etc.), Ital. *bisante, icona*, Sp. *sándalo*, etc.
2. Sometimes, we find the Ac. (Ital. *duca, limaca*) or a change in number (Ital. *algalia*, Sp. *botarga*) or declension (of the type *despotus*) or an adaptation with a particular suffix (Ital. *fanale* from φανάριον) or a verbal unification (**galamateus*, Sp. *galimatías*, from κατὰ Ματθαῖον) or a semantic change (such as that of *archipiélago*).
3. There are contaminations: **petroleum* from πετρέλαιον on the Lat. *oleum*, *trepalium* from τριπάσσαλον 'instrument of torture', on the Lat. *palus*.
4. There are semantic calques: from ἀπόκρεως we obtain MLat. *carnelevare*, from which we obtain Sp. *carnaval*.
5. Latin Hellenisms, as Latinisms in general, passed not only to the Romance languages, but also the Germanic and other languages (OHG. *pergamin*, MHG. *tievel* < *diabolus*, etc., and words of diverse origins, cf. al. *Kirsche* < *cerasus, Pfirsich* < *persicus, Quitte* < *cydoneus, Zwetschge* < *damascenus*). In other languages too, for example, Basque and Albanian, cf. H. Lüdtke 1974, pp. 181 ff., 186 ff.
6. Occasionally, we can follow the route by which words derived from the Greek penetrated from one language to another.

> For example, in Spanish we have influences of French Hellenisms, as in *cisne, cofre, monje, golpe, tapiz, anís*; from Italian, *calma, chusma, gruta* (but these are probably words that came from Byzantium through other Italian languages, without Latin as an intermediate language – we shall discuss these later). In English there is a series of Hellenisms which have entered through French: *abbey, baptism, blasphemy, chair, charity, clergy, govern, homily, parish, parliament.*

In German, in parallel, Hellenisms entered through French, as for instance, OHG. *Prestar* < OFr. *prestre* < Lat. *presbyter* < Gr. πρεσβύτερος; other times, there are semantic calques (OHG. *salmsang* 'psalter').

376. Let us now look at the Hellenisms which entered through a popular route, through the Byzantine dominions in Italy. Although, as I have said, it is not always easy to make a distinction. As before, I will provide a brief historical introduction.

Byzantine influence was particularly important in Ravenna, Venice and Genoa, as well as in southern Italy, Amalfi, Naples, Sicily, and even Rome. From these centres, a series of Byzantine words were diffused throughout the western Mediterranean.

Ravenna was, as we know, the capital of the Byzantine exarchate of Italy, from the mid-sixth century to the mid-eighth century. It possessed Genoa until the mid-seventh century; and also Venice, which after the fall of the exarchate became a dukedom with a loose dependence on Byzantium in the ninth century, becoming independent and even a rival in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Subsequently, from the thirteenth century onwards, Venice had settlements in Constantinople, as well as Genoa, and even possessions in the islands mentioned above. Until about the year 1000, Dalmatia was also under Byzantine rule and there was an analogous exchange between the two.

In short, a close relationship existed, as reflected in the introduction of Italianisms in Byzantium (as we have seen) and in the acceptance of Greek vocabulary, which was later diffused into other languages, in Venice, Genoa and other regions. The Hellenisms of Ravenna are almost invaribly related to daily life, industry, and clothing; those of Venice, to trade and navigation, the Church, technology, banking and fashion. Similarly with those of Dalmatia, which diffused these Byzantisms in the Slavic world.

Southern Italy was conquered by Justinian and from the seventh

century onwards received many immigrants who were fleeing from Islam; in the eighth century, immigrants fleeing from the Iconoclasts, and in the ninth century, many more from Sicily, which was lost to the Muslims, previously having been conquered by Justinian.

Many Greek convents were founded in southern Italy and also in Rome. Greek culture flourished in these convents (and later even in Sicily, under the Normans), as discussed in §§ 369 f.

Thus, Italy was a centre of diffusion for the Greek lexicon, not just of the lexicon which entered through a cultural route, but also of that which entered by means of trade, and personal and political relations. Let us look at some examples.

377. To illustrate, I will provide examples of some Byzantisms which penetrated the Italian dialects and sometimes, from here, other Western languages by means of trade and other means, in the Middle Ages.

From the Ravenna exarchate, from the ninth century: in various dialects, *delta* 'rim of a triangular well' < δέλτα, *ardica* 'hall of the church' < ἄρθηκα, *butinus* 'hole' < βόθυνος, *buter* 'butter' < βούτυρον, *anguria* 'cucumber' < ἀγγούριον, *bronzo* 'bronze' < *βρόντιον, *deuma* 'model' < δεῖγμα.

From Genoa: *cintraco, centrego* 'inferior functionary' < κένταρχος.

From Venice: *dromo* 'fence' < δρόμος, *liago* 'balcony' < ἡλιακός, *prostimo* 'fine' < πρόστιμον, *messeta* 'broker, currency exchange agent' < μεσίτης, *agio* 'charter' < ἀγώγιον, *staria* 'firm land' < στερέα, *stradioto* 'soldier' < στρατιώτης, *gripo* 'small ship' < γρῖπος, *gondola* < κοντούρα.

From Dalmatia: *inchona* < εἰκόνα, *condúra* < κοντούρα.

From southern Italy and Sicily: *ana* < ἀνά 'in equal parts', *parabisu* < *παράβεισος < παράδεισος, *romeus* 'pilgrim' < ῥωμαῖος, *malanzana* 'aubergine' < μελιντζάνα.

It is frequent for the same word to appear, with variants, in the different Italian dominions; and Latin forms of many of them are found, whether created from the dialectal forms or as intermediate forms: it is often difficult to tell, but the literary route is favoured in cases such as Sp. *paraíso*, Cat. *paradís*, whereas the Italianism is evident in other cases.

On the other hand, many of these words had a wide diffusion outside Italy, as stated earlier: they were imported through the Italian forms, when not directly through Latin. For instance, Sp. *anchoa* (Gr. ἀφύη), *brújula* (πυξίς), *calma* (καῦμα), *gruta* (κρυπτή), *póliza* (ἀπόδειξις). In old French, we can cite examples of Italianisms of Greek origin

(sometimes through Provençal), such as *bourse*, Fr. *chiere* (< κάρα, cf. Sard., Prov., Cat., Sp., Port., *cara*), *falot* (φάρος), *golfe*, *calme*, *casse* (κάψα), *médaille* (μέταλλον), *moustache*, *magasin*, *page* (< *pagio* < παιδίον), *risque*, etc.; others infiltrated through an intermediate Arabic (for instance, *carat*, Gr. κεράτιον) or, usually, from Latin (with a classical pronounciation, as in *chemeil* 'camel' or Byzantine, as in *tapis*).

To cite a word of general extension: the word for 'admiral', from the Gr. ἀμιρᾶς (in turn, from the Arabic) which, contaminated with the Latin *ad-*, has extended to all the languages from Norman Sicily through Genoa.

378. Let us now turn to the eastern Byzantine contacts. We have discussed the relation betweeen Byzantium and the Goths, Slavs and Arabs. In all these cases, the Greek lexicon found an opening in the respective languages.

We have looked at Greek borrowings in Gothic. The Goths were a Germanic people who had direct contact with Byzantium, as we know; but this was mainly the branch of the Ostrogoths, who disappeared from history in the sixth century. Nevertheless, their Christianisation and alphabetisation, together with their translation of the Bible into their language, placed them above the other Germanic peoples to whom they transmitted some Hellenisms complementing those which entered through Latin.

For example, we find κυριακόν 'house of the lord', which was the name for church in various Germanic languages (Ger. *Kirche*, Eng. *church* with the Scottish variant *kirk*); πάπας, παπᾶς (Goth. *papa*, OHG. *pfaffo*, Ger. *Pfaffe*); πεντηκοστή (Ger. *Pfingsten*); Ἄρεως ἡμέρα (Aust. and Bav. *Ertag*); πέμπτη (Aust. and Bav. *Pfinztag*); σάββατον (Goth. **sambat*, Ger. *Samstag*).

Other Hellenisms, through ecclesiastical Latin, penetrated in ancient times into the Germanic languages: for instance, ANord. *tollr*, OHG. *tol*, from Vulg. Lat. *toloneum* (Gr. τελωνεῖον), OHG. *Biscof* 'bishop', *Münster* 'monastery'.

Borrowings in Slavic

379. We still need to look at Greek borrowings in Old Bulgarian (and the other Slavic languages) and in Arabic. Through the first route, Hellenisms penetrated all the Slavic world, and through the second route, they increased their presence in the western world. As before, I will start by giving a brief historical introduction.

380. For the relations between the Greeks and other Indo-European peoples in general, see the book by F. Villar 1996a. For Gothic, see W. Streitberg 1919, M. H. Jellinek 1926, pp. 19 ff. and 186 ff., W. P. Lehmann 1986 (see Greek borrowings on p. 537 ff.). For Slavic, see F. Dvornik 1956 and Adrados 1987.

For the relations between the Arabs of the Caliphate of Baghdad and Byzantium, as well as for translations from Greek, see J. Vernet 1978 and my book Adrados 2001, p. 21 ff. For the Greek lexicon which entered Spanish through Arabic, cf. R. Lapesa 1980 (8th ed.), p. 131 ff. and M. Fernández-Galiano 1966, p 57 f. For its entry into French, see Ewert s. a., p. 296.

381. We are familiar with the main episodes of the meeting between Byzantium and the Bulgarians and with the relations between them. Let us now focus on the language.

The Slavic language was not written: instead, the Slavs used Greek in their inscriptions, starting with the great inscription of the khan Krum in Madara. In Greek, the khan was called ἄρχων or βασιλεύς.

After the foundation of the Bulgarian state by khan Kubrat in 681, the conversion to Christianity, once again, initiated the process of alphabetisation and increased Greek cultural influence. This was undertaken by King Boris (852–89), after a complex history in which the Germanic empire, Rome and Byzantium disputed religious and political dominion over the Slavs, leaving the latter some room to manoeuvre: in the end, the pressure exerted by the empire and the papacy forced Boris to seek protection with Byzantium.

The influence of Byzantium was great, as reflected in the construction of palaces (in Preslav and Pliska) and in close relations of all kinds: King Simeon, for example, studied in Constantinople. This relationship was not interrupted with the destruction of the Bulgarian kingdom by the Byzantines (1018), who occupied the country, or with the creation of the second Bulgarian kingdom (1185–1396).

From our perspective, the most interesting thing was the creation of Slavic writing, based on the Greek, by the monks or missionaries Cyril and Methodius – two Greek brothers from Salonika who were very familiar with Slavic at a time when the Slavic tribes were surrounding the city.

As I stated earlier, the history is rather complex. There was a power struggle between the Byzantine and Germanic empires – which was reflected in these missionaries being sent to Bohemia and Moravia – with the popes of Rome playing an often adverse, often ambiguous role with regard to petitions for the creation of an

autocephalous Bulgarian Church with a Slavic liturgy. The Photian schism (concluded in 863) favored this idea, although in the end, Bohemia and Moravia (where Cyril and Methodius had first preached) were left under the sphere of influence of the Romano-Germanic empire.

The fact is, the Slavic alphabet had been invented for this evangelisation, and it was implanted, from the year 885, in Bulgaria, when Boris accepted Methodius's disciples, who had fled from Moravia. In 925, Simeon managed to establish a patriarchy in Bulgaria: this was the Golden Age of Bulgaria. Later, the Slavic liturgy spread to Pannonia, Croatia and Dalmatia.

382. It is significant that an important school of Bulgarian literature was formed at this point, with Clement of Ochrid and others: from here, Slavic literature spread to the Ukraine and other Slavic countries. In the principality of Kiev, King Vladimir (978–1015) took the initiative to convert. It should be pointed out that in Bulgaria, as in the Ukraine, the translation of sacred and profane Greek texts formed the core of the new literature: liturgical writings, John Chrysostom, John Damascene, Malalas, Cosmas Indicopleustes, the *Physiologus*, etc. There was an undeniable continuation of Byzantine literature, or literature adopted by the Byzantines.

Indeed, there were two forms of script, Glagolitic and Cyrillic, derived respectively from the Greek alphabet in minuscule and in uncial. The latter imposed itself and continues to serve the Slavic languages, except for those that fell under western influence.

There were lexical borrowings from the start: in names of persons, in toponymics, and in words like *pinix* < φοῖνιξ, *ankjura* < ἄγκυρα, *dijavol* < διάβολος, *myro* < μύρον, etc., all found in the translation of the Gospels; and, of course, the creation of a syntax and prose based on the Greek model.

Now, we are not just dealing with Old Bulgarian or eccleciastical Slavic. Throughout the first period of the Middle Ages, Greek words from the Byzantine territories entered into the different Slavic languages (sometimes through Latin, see H. Mihaescu 1993, p. 430 ff.). For example, from Gr. εἰκόνα we obtain OSerb. *icona*; from ῥάσον 'coarse woolen cloth', OSerb. *rasa*; from πάτος 'floor' we obtain Serb.-Croat, *patos*; from διάκονος, *žakan*; from κέρασος 'cherry', OSlav. *čerša*, Bulg. *črеša*. These words were often also carried into Rumanian and Albanian.

In short, if Greek influence in the West was exerted, fundamentally, through Latin, in the East it was exerted through Slavic.

Borrowings in Arabic

383. It should be pointed out that the Arabs, emerging from the desert as conquerors of Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Persia, western India, North Africa and Spain, were enormously influenced by Greco-Byzantine culture, as well as Persian and Roman culture, in art and architecture (including of a military type), literature, philosophy and science. Indeed, from a certain perspective, the Arab conquest constituted a re-Hellenisation: part of the Greek legacy was introduced in the Middle Ages through the Arabs, the other part being introduced through Rome.

They were not the only route, but the translations from Greek (and from Sanskrit, Pahlavi, Coptic, and Syriac) into Arabic during the Abbāsid dynasty in Baghdad, were of fundamental importance. A whole school of Syriac translators worked in Edessa on the translation of Greek (and Pahlavi) texts into Syriac and Arabic, and of Arabic texts (often of Pahlavi and remote Sanskrit origin) into Greek; this activity was later continued in Baghdad with Hunayn Ibn Ishak, towards 850.

The Arabs were more interested in philosophy and the sciences than in poetry. Most of their literature and thought reflected this: from the philosophers influenced by Aristotle or the Platonists and Gnostics, to the physicians, botanists, astrologists, mathematicians, and others. Subsequently, part of this literature was translated into Latin in the thirteenth century in Toledo: the two routes of transmission of Greek culture came together. But there were older translations in Italy, such as those of Hippocrates and Galen by a monk, Constantine of Monte Cassino.

384. Personally, I feel that Arabic poetry owes much to erotic Greek poetry, especially in its popular versions from Alexandria and Syria, with which we are somewhat familiar, and to the ideas of the Epicureans, Cynics, and Sceptics, reflected in authors such as Omar Khayyam, Hafiz, Ben Cuzman and many Andalucian poets.

Of course, not only the Arabs but also the Jews were influenced by the Greeks: for example, Moses of León, influenced by the Gnostics, and Sem Tob, by the sapiential tradition. We have already discussed the introduction of the Greek lexicon into Rabbinic literature.

385. Returning to the Arabs, we know about their cultural undertaking in great detail: how the Caliphs al-Mansūr and al-Ma'mūm obtained Greek manuscripts through their conquests or embassies to Byzantium, or as ransom: so that, at the end of al-Mansūr's life, we find Arabic translations of Plato, Aristotle, Hippocrates, Galen, Euclid, and later of Vettius Valens, Dioscorides, etc. Or, indeed, how a manuscript of Dioscorides was sent by Romanus to Abderraman III, and nobody in Cordoba could understand it so the Byzantine emperor had to send a translator, etc.

As always, the influence of the Greek language reached the Arabs through a two-way route: through the spoken language (in the East, in Sicily, Africa, and Spain), which provided terms relating to the realities of the Mediterranean world and Byzantine life and practices; and through the literature, which was translated and imitated and which introduced the Arabs to the intellectual world of the Greeks.

386. Here are some examples of Arabic terms derived from Greek, which later penetrated the western languages. I will cite examples which give a Spanish derivative: καισαρεῖον > *qaisārīya* (Sp. *alcaicería*); χάρτης > *qariṭās* (Sp. *carta*); τέλεσμα > *tilasm* (Sp. *talismán*); σιγιλλᾶτος (from Lat. *sigillatus*) > *siqirlāṭ* > Sp. *escarlata*; μαλλωτή > *mallūṭa* > Sp. *marlota*; περιβόλαιον > Mozar. *fir(i)wil* > Sp. *ferreruelo*.

Also, here follows a list of Spanish words derived from Arab words of Greek origin, taken from the *Historia de la Lengua Española* by D. Rafael Lapesa 1980:

Among the plants, fruits, fish, etc.: *acelga* (σικελός), *adelfa* (δάφνη), *albaricoque* (βερίκοκκον), *albérchigo* (περσικόν), *alcaparra* (κάππαρις), *alfóstigo* (πιστάκη), *almáciga* (μαστίχη), *altramuz* (θύρμος), *arroz* (ὄρυζα), *atún* (θύννος), *cazuz* 'ivy' (κισσός), *jibia* (σηπία), *zumo* (ζωμός). Scientific and technical terms: *alambique* (ἄμβιξ), *albéitar* (ἱππίατρος), *adarme* (δραχμή), *alquimia* (χυμεία). From daily life and luxury: *abalorio* (βήρυλλος), *ébano* (ἔβενος), *fondac, fonda, alhóndiga* (πανδοχεῖον), *guitarra* (κιθάρα), *quilate* (κεράτιον).

To show that this is not just a Spanish phenomenon (although it was certainly widespread here), I will give examples of French words derived from Arab words taken from the Greek: *alchimie, amalgame, alcool, alambic, ambre, coton, élixir, gazelle, harem, jupe, nadir*. Some of these words penetrated into other languages: Spanish (*algalife, papegai, abrico, pastèque*), Portuguese (*épinard*); Italian (*arsenal, chiffre, girafe*).

CHAPTER THREE

GREEK IN THE EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

1. The penetration of Greek-Latin in the European languages

Generalities

387. Greek did not end with Greek or Roman Antiquity or with the Byzantine Middle Ages. Its agitated life – always the same, yet always different – continued until the present day with Modern Greek.

Yet, we have seen how in Antiquity as in the Middle Ages, Greek – its lexicon above all, but also its morphology, syntax and even its literary genres – began to infiltrate different languages, including the European languages (Slavic, Romance, Germanic) which began to take shape during the ninth century.

We have already studied part of this process. The Greek words sometimes come from Byzantium, sometimes from Medieval Latin, which continued the old Graeco-Latin we have discussed and which as we know was the language of the Church and of culture in the Middle Ages. We left our study around approximately the twelfth century, stressing that it is not always easy to establish a chronology for the borrowings, or their Byzantine or Latin source. Now we shall place emphasis on Hellenisms taken from a literary source from the twelfth century onwards, with some older precedents. We will find that there is a steady escalation in the numbers of Hellenisms entering European languages, which continues all the way up until the present day.

388. Let us make some preliminary observations.

1. Our study is focussed on Spanish, with references to French, Italian, English and German, above all, but with the awareness that many Hellenisms also made their way into many other languages, and indeed, today, all the languages of the world.

2. On the other hand, our study intends to offer general ideas, as well as some examples. A broad, up-to-date study with a general focus has not really existed until now.
3. Up to the sixteenth century, Hellenisms nearly always entered through Latin (except for those from Byzantium); from then on, they also entered directly from Greek texts.
4. We should recognise the importance of this: from ancient times, but later to an ever greater degree, Hellenisms were originally not just foreign words which were later assimilated into the different languages, but also a source of formative elements (roots, suffixes, prefixes, methods of compostition and derivation) which were very fertile within each language, creating new words. In this sense, we can say that Greek survives in our languages as a dynamic, integral part of them.
5. Finally, I should also stress that, although studied here to a lesser extent, Greek grammar (particularly syntax) and literature, directly or indirectly became constituted as models: they have continued to develop and are still very much alive. In view of this, I have stated on a number of occasions that our European languages (which are in turn models of others in this respect) are in fact a semi-Greek or crypto-Greek. At times, the Greek element is remote and difficult to describe when it has provided semantic calques and words which have been fully integrated with phonetic and semantic variations.

389. For Spanish, see in particular M. Fernández-Galiano 1966 (much used in the following discussion) J. Berguz 2002 and the bibliography given on p. 65, n. 11, in addition to R. Lapesa 1980; for French, F. Brunot 1966; for German, W. Stammler (ed.) 1952; for English, A. Ewert s. a., A. C. Baugh 1971 and F. Fernández 1982; for Italian, B. Migliorini 1968.

Hellenisms in the high Middle Ages

390. We begin our discussion with some elaborations on the introduction of Hellenisms through Latin in the Medieval period. The Carolingian renaissance of the ninth century, with similar phenomena in countries such as Ireland and Spain, produced waves of Latinisms; among them were Greek words (whether of ecclesiastical origin or not) which had been integrated into Latin.

After so many medieval Hellenisms from Latin (which existed already in Latin in the period in which the Romance languages were

derived from it, and very often even earlier), we also find Latin cultural words, often of Hellenic origin, in the first texts in Castilian. In the *Poema de Mío Cid* we find *mirra, tus* 'incense'; in the *Auto de los Reyes Magos, retóricos, gramatgos.*

In the thirteenth century, Latinism, and with it Hellenism, became accentuated: Berceo uses *abysso* 'abyss', *epistolero, evengelistero* (mixed formations); the *Apollonius* uses *ídolo*; the *Alexandre* uses *prólogo, silogismo, elemento.* Naturally, this increased in the prose of Alfonso X the Wise, which required a technical language which sometimes borrowed from Arabic, sometimes from Latin or Graeco-Latin. On occasion, the Latin or Greek vocabulary was accompanied by its interpretation in Castilian: for instance, in the case of *teatro* ('a large and round yard').

I will give some examples of these words. Scientific and technical terms such as *alegoría, apoplejía, aritmética, átomo, auténtico, clima, crónica (corónica), dialéctica, filosofía, geometría, glosa, gramatica (gramatgo), historia (estoria), lógica, música, planeta, poeta, policía* ('politics'), *retórico (retóligo), sílaba, sofisma, teología, teórica.* Mythical beings, exotic plants and animals, ancient cultural elements: *áloe, Amazona, amomo, bálsamo, ballena, búfalo (búbalo), camello, centauro, ceptro (cetro), cocodrilo, draco (drago, dragón), elefante (elifant), gigante, grifo, pergamino, tesoro, trono.*

It should be noted that sometimes there is a Romance adaptation, and sometimes a pure Latinism. Also, there are mixed forms such as *bígamo.* Recall too how Latin words that already gave rise to derivatives in the Romance languages, were reintroduced and produced semi-literary forms, as in the case of *monasterium* and *ecclesia.*

391. To provide an example, let us briefly discuss the Hellenisms of French, introduced through a cultural route, recalling how some of these, resulting from the Norman conquest, were carried into English. In writings from the period of Charlemagne we already come across words such as *element, angele, chrestien*; and the following are also of ancient date, from an ecclesiastical context: *abisme, anateme, apostle, baptisier, baptistere, basilique, diacre, eglise, estatue, heretique, idée, idole, isope, pape, paradis, scisme, sinagoge, throne, timpan.* In works of Medieval science: *allegorie, aloés, amesthyste, aromatiser, astronomien, basilisc, element, embleme, nigromance, zone.*

It is easy to see how, as in Castilian, there is sometimes adaptation to the Romance language, and even derivation.

392. Similar observations can be made with regard to the German language. In addition to the Latin borrowings from the ancient period,

which I have already discussed, a new wave of cultural words entered, partly of Greek origin, from the ninth century onwards, which the Anglo-Saxon missionaries helped to diffuse: OHG. *scuola, prêstar, pergamîn, arzat (< archiater), postolīh.* There were also semantic calques, such as OHG. *forasako* for *profēta, gotspël* and *cuatchundida* for *evangelium*, which was also present. Later, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, we find *poête, zëpter* and, in scientific writings, the terms *grammatica, dialectica, physica*, etc. Then, in the thirteenth century, *metaphysica, melancholisch, musica.*

In parallel with this, in English we find the words *allegory, mechanical, polite, zephyr*, among others. But the principal influence on English in these centuries came from French, which often introduced Latinisms and Hellenisms.

Hellenisms in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries

In Castilian

393. In the period from the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries, words descending from Latin (and stylistic resources such as hyperbaton) were introduced into the western languages, first gradually, then in great numbers; these included a considerable number of Hellenisms. Other Hellenisms continued to enter from French or Italian through a cultural or, more frequently, colloquial route. Others finally began to enter directly through Greek literature from the fifteenth century onwards, when it became known in the West. Works such as the translation of Dioscorides by Andrés Laguna (155) were a source of Hellenisms (mostly of a scientific type, alongside the literary Hellenisms).

The Hellenisms were adapted in form to Latin transcription and sometimes modern language use, there were also hypercorrrections. Changes in meaning were also introduced when necessary.

It should be noted that this period is characterised by two, often opposing, often converging tendencies. On the one hand, Antiquity and its authors were adored and considered as models: Juan de Mena considered the *Iliad* a *'sancta e seráphica obra'*, and the romance *'rudo y desierto'*. In the fourteenth century, we have translations of Greek by Fernández de Heredia and from Latin by the chancellor Ayala.

Hellenisms such as *olligarchía, político, theremotu, ypócrita, astralobio*, entered the works of these authors. Authors such as the marquis of Villena and the marquis of Santillana, Juan de Mena and Fernando de Rojas followed the ancient models, as would Garcilaso, Fray Luis,

Hurtado de Mendoza, and so many others. The same was true for the other European nations.

394. On the other hand, this was also the period in which the new languages would acquire their definitive form and gradually would become the only languages of literature (although Garcilaso and Fray Luis, among others, continued to write in Latin). With his *Gramática* and his Latin-Spanish and Spanish-Latin *Diccionarios* of 1492 (following the *Universal Vocabulario* of 1490 by Alfonso Fernández de Palencia), Nebrija laid the foundations for the use of Castilian or Spanish as a language of culture just like Greek and Latin; almost half a century would pass before the appearance of a Latin-French dictionary by Robert Etienne.

The Castilian language, now integrated into Spanish, was extolled by Luis Vives, as Italian was by Bembo, French by Du Bellay, or English by Mulcaster. The development of the German language was slower, promoted by Luther: until 1680 the majority of books were edited in Latin.

Yet, this advance of national languages was not an obstacle for the introduction of literary words: on the contrary, they were needed now more than ever, and the Latin language, serving as a model, functioned as a huge deposit of words that could be introduced (and used, at times, for the expression of new concepts) – many of these words having, of course, a Greek origin.

It was not just a question of words, but also of prefixes and suffixes which functioned freely, perfectly assimilated within Latin from the ancient period. In English, for example, among the 'learned prefixes' we find, *amphi-*, *a(n)-/an(a)-*, *arch(i)-*, *aut(o)-*, *cata-*, *di-*, *hyper-*, *hypo-*, *mono-*, *pant(o)-*, *prot(o)-*, *syn-*, which are also found in other languages; and suffixes such as *-ism*, *ist*, *-ite*, *ize*, etc. (the same observation applies). There are others more.

395. From the fifteenth century, Hellenisms from the field of botany, in a literary or Romanised form, were introduced into Spanish: for example, *acacia*, *celidonia*, *cerfollo* (< Lat. *caerefolium* < Gr. χαιρέφυλλον, then *perifollo*), *dragontea*, *eléboro*, *jacinto*; also, Hellenisms from exotic animals, such as *áspid*, *delfín*, *dromedario*, *hiena*, *lince*, *tigre*; from medicine, such as *agonia*, *arteria*, *cardíaco*, *cólico*, *diarrea*, *frenesí*, *gangrena*, *manía*, *pronóstico*, *tísico*; from chemistry or pharmacy, such as *amoníaco*, *arsénico*; from mathematics, astronomy and other sciences, such as *ártico*, *boreal*, *caos*, *catarata*, *estadio*, *cilindro*, *cono*, *cubo*, *giro*, *matemáticas*, *nauta*, *polo*,

trópico, zona; from grammar, music and literature, such as *academia, alfabeto, apócope, armonía, biblioteca, comedia, diptongo, elegía, etimologia, metro, oda, ortografia, proemio, prólogo, ritmo, sintaxis, tragedia*; from thought, literature, and politics, such as *cínico, diálogo, enigma, fantastico, héroe, pedagogía, período, político, sofista, tirano*; from mythology, such as *ambrosía, laberinto, musa, sátiro, sirena.*

We should also recall the Hellenisms imported through French *(page, dátil)*, Italian *(galea, golfo, pórfido)*, Arabic in the fifteenth century (we have already mentioned a few, we can add *alambique, alcaparra, almoraduj* (ἀμάρακος), *bodoque* (< ποντικόν, a type of nut). Also through Catalan and Portuguese. But from the sixteenth century onwards, Byzantinisms rarely entered directly.

In contrast, the number of scientific Hellenisms increased. For instance, from botany, such as *acanto, achicoria* (< *cichoria* < κιχόριον), *amaranto, anémona, asfodelo, camomila* (< *chamaemelon* < χαμαίμηλον), *crisantemo, ebano, iris, menta, mirto, opio.* From medicine: *antídoto, asma, cataplasma, colirio, diafragma, dosis, laringe, narcótico, páncreas, tisana*, etc. From zoology: *fénix, hipopótamo.* From chemistry: *cáustico, colofonia.* From construction: *arquitecto, aula, maquina, mecánico.* From mathematics, geography, sailing: *ábaco, atlas, estadio, escálamo, éter, horizonte, istmo.* From grammar and literature: *anástrofe, apólogo, catálogo, encyclopedia, erótico, frase, lira.* From thought and politics: *aristocracia, asilo, catástrofe, déspota, diálogo, idea, teoría.* From mythology and the ancient world: *atleta, néctar, ninfa, obelisco.*

396. Cultural words, as indicated previously, were adapted in various ways. By means of vocalic changes: *orégano, láudano, rumbo*; by changes in suffix *(poesía, hipocresía, amatista, diáfano)*; by haplology *(idolatría)*; by change in gender *(diadema).* Also, by other means: *achicoria* (< κιχόριον), *algalia* 'catheter' (ἐργαλεῖον), *cornisa* (< κορωνίς), *panadizo* (< παρωνύχιον), *perlesia, pocima* (< ἀπόζεμα), *tericia, almorranas, párrafo, teulogía* and *iproquesía* in Saint Teresa. Naturally, educated forms very often appear together with vulgar forms.

There are also changes in meaning. The following words acquired values related to religion or the Church: *cimborio* (κιβώριον, the fruit of the waterlily and a cup of a similar form), *clero, cripta, dogma, jerarquía, liturgia, ortodoxo, presbítero, pompa, tiara*; and other values, for example, *chisme* (from σχίσμα), *quimera.*

There was a definite acceleration in the growth of Graeco-Latin which was never quite forgotten and which now became Graeco-Spanish (and Graeco-French, etc.). This literary and scientific Greek

vocabulary was imposed in order to serve a common culture. With it came an increase in prefixes and suffixes, which were increasingly transformed into the elements of the new languages, which would use them in their own formations.

This was because these languages lacked an adequate vocabulary for the new culture and especially the new science, which were both intimately connected to Antiquity.

The same phenomenon that had occcurred in Latin, when, under similar circumstances, its lexical poverty *(patrii semonis egestas)* was overcome with the help of Greek, was now reproduced here, with the help of the Graeco-Latin we have been discussing and, on occasion, with the help of Greek directly.

In French

397. Similar conclusions can be extracted from the study of French. In the thirteenth century we find words which have been taken from Latin, often with a French derivation, such as *austérité, authentique, bigame* (mixed Graeco-Latin form), *machination, margarite, physician, politique, practicien, rhétorique,* along with many words that are more purely Latin.

This increased in the fourteenth century when kings and princes encouraged translations of Latin. To take a few examples of the borrowings: *agronome, allegorique, anarchie, anatomie, antipode, apoplectique, apostasie, apostat, apostumeux, apostumer, architectonique, aristocratie, asthmatique, astronomique, barbarie, boreal, catalogue, cataplasme, catechisme, cautere, cephalique, cithare, climat, colerique, colon, comedie, coriandre, critique, cyclope, cynique, cynocephale, declinable, democratie, diabetique, diaphane, diaphoretique, diaphragme, diarrhee, economie, empirique, effimere, epigramme, etymologie, fantasie, farmacie, heretique, hierarchie, historien, hypotheque, maniache, mathematique, mecanique, medecin, monopole, oligarchie, pedagogie, periode, peritoneon, phlegmon, poeme, pompeux, poreux, pronostique, regmatique, spermatique, spherique, spasme, spongiosité, spongieux, tragedie, tetragone, thorax, triumpheté, tyrannique, ydrophobique.*

This list, though incomplete, reveals a series of facts:

1. The variable degree of assimilation into the French language.
2. The predominance of vocabulary from the fields we have discussed: sciences (particularly medicine), politics, literature, etc.
3. The diffusion of desinences and suffixes derived from Greek (from -α, -ος, -ικός) and Latin *(-osus, -anus, -bilis, -tas)*; also, prefixes such as *cata-* and *dia-*; the elimination of neuters in

-μα, which passed into feminines in *-me*, the derivation of verbs *(apostumer)*, etc.

In the fifteenth century, with the Renaissance rage for classical Antiquity, there was an invasion of such terms: *agaric, angeliser, apologetique, bachique, borée, caducée, fantasien, eteroclite, satére*, to name a few.

Of course, this was intensified in the sixteenth century, when the kings favoured both the classical languages and French. The sciences, in particular, were filled with Greek and Latin formative elements and terms: whether in a crude Latin and even Greek form, or in an adopted form. But there was still some controversy. Abel Mathieu criticised literary words and preferred to replace *elegie* and *hymne* with *complainte* and *chant a dieu ou aux choses saintes* respectively; Du Perron used *accord de naturel* instead of *sympathie*, and *contrenaturel* instead of ἀντιπάθεια. In contrast, Ronsard complained that in French one could not, as in Greek, say *ocymore, dispotme, oligochromien.*

There was an intermediate solution, but it could be said that Greek-Latin triumphed. Many words entered from both late and classical Latin, such as, to cite a few, *Academie, acromion, anagramme, anodyn, apophtegme, charité, chiliandre, disque, embleme, enthousiasme, epilepsie, heptagone, hydraulique, hygiene, hysterique, lythargue, magnes, metaphrene, neoterique, ode, pericarde, philogue, phlebotomie, sympathie, trachée, trapèze* and many more.

Once again, derivations and mixed forms must be taken into account: *academicien, archicoupeur, clisteriziste, diabliculer, gigantal, sumbolisation, theatrique*, etc. This indiscriminate mixture of words with a Greek or Latin root and suffixes derived from both languages, all as an extension of the French vocabulary, is a reflection of the literary language, with the strong Greek and Latin stamp we have been discussing.

Again, this is displayed mostly in the field of science and rather strange natural elements.

In Italian

398. Similarly, in Italy, from the thirteenth century onwards, the vulgar language was filled with Latinisms: not just ancient but also medieval Latinisms. In the sphere of culture (often centered around the University of Bologna) and religion, these Latinisms were often actually Hellenisms: *postolo, arismetica, canonista, clima, codicillo, diavolo, epiciclo, grammatica, martire, melodia, profeta, rettorica, sfera, sinfonia, zodiaco.* Dante (who writes in the vulgar language and justifies this with 'the

natural love of one's own language', although he considers it inferior to Latin) adds Greek words taken from his sources: *perizoma, latria, tetragono* and the false *entomata.* On the other hand, many of the Latinisms are Greek calques: *conszienza* (συνειδός), *conoscienza* (ἐπιστήμη), *dottrina* (δόγμα), *sostanza* (ὑποκείμενον), *accidente* (συμβεβηκός), etc.

The case was similar during the fourteenth century, in which poets such as Petrarch and writers such as Boccaccio flourished and in which the translation or edition of philosophical and theological works required a Graeco-Latin lexicon. Words such as the following were introduced: *ambrosia, antropofago, autentico, austero, discolo, energumeno, eunuco, sofistico.* Also, words which had been asssimilated for a long time regained their Latin form, such as *vangeo* or *evangel(i)o* for *guagnello, gigante* for *giogante.*

The fifteenth century displays the same features in Italy as in the other European countries, but with more emphasis on Humanistic culture, particularly towards the end of the century with the introduction of printing and the arrival of learned Greeks. The Humanists were conscious of the fact that they were elevating the Italian language, in prose and verse, with the help of Graeco-Latin borrowings.

Furthermore, there was a symbiosis of Latin and the vulgate: authors such as Sannazaro and Poliziano, as Dante and Boccaccio before them, wrote in both languages, Poliziano and Lorenzo de' Medici praising the Tuscan vulgate. The mixture of both languages is also frequent in the documentation of the period, which includes letters. The massive entry of Latinisms (which are sometimes Hellenisms) was thus inevitable, as was the adoption of Latin orthography in words which had acquired Italian orthography.

To cite a few examples of Hellenisms which seem to date from this period: *amaranto, calamo, cataratta, onomatopea, paraninfo, plettro, tragelafo.* There are also calques such as *insetto,* for ἔντομον.

In the sixteenth century, in the period in which Spain, France, the Pope, and Venice were the main powers, the Tuscan vulgate made substantial progress: even philosophy and mathematics, various documents and history began to be written in this language. There can be said to have been a rebellion, led by academies and poets, against tradition and the exclusive use of Latin by the universities. But, at the same time, the advance of Latinism in the vulgar language continued, albeit with various differences with respect to orthographic and morphological adaptation.

Within this advance, the Hellenisms are nearly always, as customary, taken from the scientific and literary spheres: *assioma, clinica, crisalide, ecatombe, entusiasmo, gimnico, omonimo, ottica, parafrasi, parossismo, rapsodia, scenografia, tripode.* As in other parts, there were reactions against this, such as the attempt to impose *errante* instead of *planeta;* and not all Latinisms and Hellenisms were maintained, some disappeared with the writers that introduced them, such as *bibliopola* or *elego.*

In English

399. We shall look rather briefly at the case of English, which is similar to the others; let us recall that some Hellenisms entered from French after the Norman conquest, and later from Italian.

Once again, Latin was the source of Hellenisms. The problem of deciding to what extent this new vocabulary should be accepted arose, here too, in the sixteenth century, when Thomas Wilson attacked it in his *Art of Rhetorique.* Dryden and Mulcaster took intermediate positions; as in the other cases, this was the solution adopted. In Elyot, we find *anachronism, analogy, encyclopedia, autograph*; in Moro, *monopoly, monosyllable, paradox*; in Shakespeare, *antipathy, apostrophe, catastrophe, emphasis, misanthrope, pathetical.* At times, the Latin form was retained *(climax, epitome)*, at times, the English adaptation.

Perhaps this has served to give some idea of the progress of the Graeco-Latin lexicon and the formative elements of Graeco-Latin in this period. It would be useful to adduce other languages, such as German, which lagged behind a bit. But in the end, this lexicon, from wherever it may have originated, reached all languages.

Hellenisms in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries

In Castilian

400. During the next centuries, Hellenism continued to grow in Spanish in the scientific and educated language in general.

In the seventeenth century, the poets assimilated, within the Latinisms, a reduced number of Hellenisms, largely relating to myth and various aspects of Antiquity or which were used by the Latin poets *(antro, aspid, himeneo, musa, ninfa, pánico, palestra, pira, rima, etc.).* Although a prose writer such as Quevedo was able to enrich Spanish with his use of Greek prefixes; for example, *archipobre* or *protomiseria*: this would receive a large following in more recent times.

But the other field, which was always growing, is more important. Here, as before, I will provide some examples of the new words that were introduced, divided into separate fields:

Zoology: *anfibio, foca, parásito, rinoceronte*. Chemistry and minerology: *fósforo, amianto*. Medicine: *alopecia, embrión, epidemia, reuma, síntoma, tráquea*. Mathematics: *astronomy, geography, nautics: cateto, cometa, diámetro, elipse, estrobo, geografía, hipotenusa, meteoro, náutico, paralelo, pirata*. Grammar, literature, music: *apóstrofe, crítico, dialecto, ditirambo, drama, encomio, episodio, filología, idilio, léxico, lirico, metáfora, museo, palinodia, paradoja, pleonasmo, sinónimo, tropo*. Thought and politics: *análisis, anarquía, antagonista, democracia, diploma, economia, entusiasmo, emporio, época, étnico, génesis, hipótesis, ironía, lírico, metamorfosis, método, monarca, patriota, problema, poligamia, síndico, símbolo, simpatía, tesis*. Religion: *ateo, carismo, místico, prosélito, sarcófago*. Ancient world: *esfinge, falange, gimnasio, mausoleo*.

Sometimes, derivatives were created: *cetáceo, diagonal, hipocondría*.

401. Let us now move on to the eighteenth century, where we encounter a new environment in the fields of illustration and science. Latin was still important as the intellectual language: Leibnitz and Newton wrote their main works in Latin, and Linneus used Latin to give scientific names to plants, and the Spanish *Diccionario de Autoridades* used it to define the meanings of words.

Certainly, the Romance languages had an absolute dominion as literary languages, but Latin continued to supply new vocabulary which, in the field of science, was very often Greek. On the other hand, Greek was now accessible to scientists, who did not hesitate to use it in creating the new lexicon which became necessary.

In short, the growth of science required the introduction of new waves of Latin terms, many of them Hellenisms, and of Hellenisms taken directly from Greek. This was in order to express concepts which were already present in Greek science, or to express new things or concepts with the help of Greek terms which were able to express something more or less approximate, or whose elements could be used for new formations. Often, this new vocabulary arrived in Spain through other modern languages, particularly French.

This period is characterised by the fact that, alongside the true Hellenisms that belonged mostly to the traditional fields of science and thought, great numbers of neologisms were introduced. The form and often meaning of the Greek vocabulary had always, even from Latin, undergone alterations. But now, radically new words

with Greek elements were increasingly created. This has some precedents, as for example in the words composed of both Greek and Latin which have been discussed, but now the phenomenon had added importance.

Many Hellenisms as such were introduced: for example, *aorta, autonomía, autopsia, base, bibliografía, botánica, ciclo, clepsidra, coriza, criterio, despotismo, diástole, dicotomía, didáctico, escéptico, exantema, fase, fenómeno, filántropo, filtro, hidráulico, hipódromo, isósceles, mecanismo, miope, misántropo, mitología, neumático, parodia, periferia, periódico, peroné, rombo, simetría, sinfonía, sistema, tiranía, trapecio.* Note that there are changes in suffix (*heterogéneo* < ἑτερογενής) or in meaning (diatribe 'violent discourse or writing', *polémica* 'discussion') and that French sometimes acts as an intermediary (*autómata, políglota* with *-a* due to a bad interpretation of Fr. *-e*).

The most important thing, as mentioned previously, was the growing number of neologisms demanded by the new sciences and scientific concepts, machines, etc. There is the emergence of new sciences (or arts), such as *hidrostática, mecánica, ornitología, paleografía, pirotecnia, psicología, zoología* (and *sociología*, etc.); machines and instruments such as *barómetro, microscopio* (and others in *-scopio*), *termómetro*, the machine *pneumática*, the globe *aerostático*; fluids and concepts such as *electricidad*, the *logaritmos*, etc., as well as related adjectives and nouns, such as *eléctrico, escepticismo*; verbs such as *electrizar*. New systems were created on the model of the old systems: there is *aristocracia/aristocrático*, but also *estoicismo/estoico, electricidad/eléctrico*, etc. In a recent article (Adrados 1996c) I have indicated that the eighteenth century saw the introduction of Fr. *acrobate*, Eng. *acrobat*, Sp. *acróbata*, Germ. *Akrobat*, at a time in which Gr. ἀκροβάτης was not attested (today it is): but it was easy to deduce from ἀκροβατέω, ἀκροβατικός.

In other languages

402. In other European languages we see almost the same things occurring. Only German, to a certain extent, differs somewhat due to the systematic cultivation of the semantic calque: the negative prefix *un-*; abstract suffixes *-heit, -keit, -nis; -kunde* instead of *-logía, -grafía*; adjectives with *-reich*; indigenous terms for concepts such as equality *(Gleichheit)*, Being *(Sein)*, knowledge *(Erkenntnis)*, conscience *(Gewissen)* and the grammatical terms, instead of familiar Greek terms such as *Despot/Despotismus*.

To avoid devoting too much space to this, I will limit myself to a brief description of the facts with regard to Italian.

In the seventeenth century we come across Hellenisms in the most diverse disciplines. For example, *acróstico, analfabeto, apogeo, conoide, hiperbole, molécula, panegirico, parergo, parodia, sinoride, sintassi, sintesi, patologia, pleura, prisma, scheletro, taumaturgo, tesi.* Note that sometimes the old form is recovered instead of another evolved form (*chirurgo* instead of *cerusico, clistere* instead of *cristeo* or *cristero, emmorroidi* instead of *moroide*).

We also come across neologisms, often of an international type (*selinografia* in Bacon and Galileo).

Of course, in the eighteenth century the introduction of scientific Hellenisms continued: *monopetalo, polipetalo, rizotomo, stalagmite, clinico, diagnosis, prognosis, patema, elissoide,* sometimes with a new derivation. Some Hellenisms that entered at a later date but were rarely used, were incorporated definitively into the language: *miriade, erotico.*

It is also important to note that some Hellenisms entered through foreign languages, most notably French: *analisi, aneddoto, biografo, cosmopolita, epoca.* From German we obtain *dicaster(i)o, estetica, etere* (in the chemistry sense).

We also find that the phenomenon of neologism is on the increase: *aeronautica, aerostato, anglomania, bibliofilo, bibliomane, eliocentrico, scafandro* and others, which did not prosper. There was then a great diffusion of *-ismo, -ista, -izzare,* added both to Latin and Greek terms: *botanista, cambista, capitalista, caratterizzare, dispotismo, elettrizzare, tranquilizzare.*

Hellenisms in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries

403. In these centuries, Hellenisms which had not been previously taken as borrowings were constantly introduced: often with alterations in the formation or meaning, as in the previous examples. They are mostly common to all the European languages, so that it is not always easy to establish through which language they have entered.

Let us, once again, take a few Spanish examples from the various sciences and disciplines: *abulia, afonía, anacoluto, anemia, aneurisma, aporía, apoteosis, arcaico, asceta, autarquía, autóctono, asíndeton, asteroide, astenia, batracio, biografía, clínico, colofón, cosmos, cráter, diabetes, élitro, epidermis, ecuménico, encéfalo, esquema, estético, estigma, fonética, hemiplegia, homeopatía, marasmo, necrología, neumonía, palimpsesto, pederastia, peripecia, plutocracia, pornografía, programa, próstata, quiste, sinopsis, taquígrafo, tríptico.* Some terms change in meaning, such as *ánodo, bacteria, barítono, cloro, estoma, higiene, plástico, tónico.* The ability to form small systems by means of familiar suffixes has increased.

404. But most significant is the increasing number of neologisms to satisfy the demands of the new sciences, techniques and currents of thought—whether through derivation or through the combination of Greek and Latin elements (prefixes, roots and suffixes). They tended to be international, with slight differences in form, phonetics and orthography. In effect, they constituted the new European language which coexisted with each of the modern languages, a Greek-Latin which was alive within them. Therefore, it is not very useful to study this subject language by language, although we are often left with the problem of where and when these words were invented, and by which means they were diffused. At times, certainly, there can be a lack of formal correspondence: Sp. *máquina de escribir* translates Eng. *typewriter*, Ger. *Fall* translates Lat. *casus* (and this translates Gr. πτῶσις), Ger. *Fernsprecher* translates forms of other languages with *tele-* and *-phono*.

These neologisms, which pass from one language to another, occasionally can be dated with some precision. Fr. *voiture automobile* dates from 1875, then we find *automobile*, and from there the Sp. *automóvil, auto*. The word *cinema* is dated towards 1899 (from Fr. *cinématographe*, from which we also obtain Eng. *cinema*, Ger. *Kino*). The word *teléfono* dates from the last quarter of the nineteenth century, *maratón* from 1896 onwards (the resumption of the Olympics), *aeroplano* from the start of the twentieth century, and later *televisión*. Some words descend from others, sometimes with a change in meaning of one of their elements: in *fotografía, foto-* is still 'light', but in *fotocopia* etc. it is 'image'. *Auto-* is no longer 'the same' in Ital. *autostrada*, Sp. *autopista* or *autovia.*

Neologisms respond most frequently, as we pointed out, to the scientific language (sometimes existing with other meanings). Consequently, they supply the names of various sciences: *arqueología, binomio, biología, geología, histología, morfología, numismática, ontología, ortopedia, psiquiatría, psicoanálisis*, etc. They also refer to medicine: *anestesia, asepsia, astigmatismo, blenorragia, colitis, flebitis, metabolismo, microbio, neuralgia, organismo, quirófano*, etc.; to the natural sciences: *eucalipto, cromo, glucosa, hidrógeno, hormona, organismo, orquídea, oxígeno, proteína*, etc.; to various techniques: *aeródromo, aeroplano, astronauta* (and compounds with *-nauta*), *automóvil* (and compounds with *auto-*), *batiscafo, cine (cinema, cinematógrafo), clónico, endocrinología, filatelia* (and derivatives with *fil[o]-*), *hermeroteca* (and compounds with *-teca*), *hipoglucemia* (and derivatives with

hipo-), *megaterio* (and compounds with *mega-*), *metro (metropolitano), micrófono* (and compounds with *micro-*), *ortodoncia* (and compounds with *orto-*), *pancromático* (and compounds with *pan-*), *paranoico* (and compounds with *para-*), *pediatra* (and compounds with *ped-* and derivatives in *-iatra*), *taxi (taxímetro), teléfono* (and compounds with *tele-*), *termostato* (and compounds with *termo-*), etc. Others belong to less specialised fields: *melancolía, nostalgia, panorama.*

405. This is but a short list of examples, which can be extended easily in books such as those by Eseverri 1945 or González Castro 1994 or Bergua 2002. Yet, we do not have a complete repertory, either for Spanish or the other languages which indicates the date of first appearance, diffusion and frequency.

It is clear that a Greek lexicon appears in our languages in two ways:

(a) Assimilated, from different dates and through different means. It has become an integral element of the lexicon of our languages, and is felt by speakers to be part of them.
(b) Forming part of the stratum of the cultural and scientific lexicon: from a Greek-Latin that forms a special stratum within each language, accepting characteristics of the language, but remaining essentially the same in all of them. It consists of intact Greek words, others that are formally or sematically altered, or various neologisms; always alternating or combining with the Latin lexicon, with which it forms an integrated whole. There is an abundance of hybrid formations of the type *binomio, monocorde*, etc.

This is the Greek-Latin we have been discussing, which was created in gradual stages through the ages, but which culminated in our age and is advancing towards the future. It is the most living and active lexical element that exists: its original compositional elements combine with those of the new languages; and the new words pass from one language to another: for example, *burocracia* from French, and *autocar* from English. It is curious that a new wave of Greek and Latin terms should be arriving through the latter language (*tecnología, macro, base de datos*, etc.), as well as transcriptions with *ch* and *th.*

Next, I shall deal with the place of this Greek-Latin in our languages today. As I have stated, it is not a fossil element, such as

the lexicon from Arabic or other languages, including some Greek elements. It is a linguistic stratum of enormous vitality, making it at the same time a unifying agent of all the cultural languages and today, indeed, of all the world's languages.

2. Description of the place and function of Greek-Latin in present day European languages

Origins and characteristics of this lexicon

406. We have described the essential features of the Greek-Latin of Antiquity and have shown how after a long period of decline, the lexicon of the modern languages was slowly reconstructed with the aid of Graeco-Latin terms incorporated into the new medieval languages through different means – particularly through Latin literature and later Greek literature, but also directly from the Greek lexicon.

We have also indicated, although much more detail is needed, to what extent Greek-Latin is today the most dynamic element in our languages. Also, how it essentially forms a unique language within the western languages (and indeed all the world's languages). Let us make some specific observations.

407. In general, there are simple and regular correspondences between the different modern languages: for example, Sp. *democracia*/Fr. democratie/Eng. *democracy*/Ger. *Demokratie*/Ital. *democrazia*/Rus. демократия, have innumerable parallels with exact correspondences in phonetics, orthography and suffix; the same is true of other series, such as those with Eng. *-ty*, Fr. *-té*, Sp. *-dad*, Ital. *-tà*, and with series with the same prefixes.

But there are variations which are sometimes a product of historical accidents, such as the splitting of a word or element into two or more: Sp. *cátedra*/*cadera*, *música*/*murga*, *arce-*/*archi-*/*arqui-*/*arz-*: routinely, the popular forms are left out of the Graeco-Latin system. They may also be a result of lexical variations (Ger. *Autobahn*/Ital. *autostrada*/Sp. *autopista*, *autovia*) or of external influences, including errors of transcription (Sp. *-íe* and not *-ía* in *hematíe*, due to a bad interpretation of Fr. *l'hématie*, *les hématies*). Also, one word may be borrowed directly, through another language, resulting in two forms and two meanings (*cráter*/*cratera*, from Fr., with the same error).

Variations may also result from formal hesitations in the transcription of borrowings. There are irregularities in transcription even in modern times, see the books already cited by Eseverri and González Castro, as well as Fernández-Galiano 1969 and J. Berguz 2002.

408. As we have seen, Gneek-Latin coincides to a large extent with the concept of the scientific language, although there are also non-Graeco-Latin words. This concept and even that of the cultural language in general, goes beyond its limits. It has been used to create small lexical systems of very varied values, of the type *hijo/filial*, *hermano/fraternal*, *ojo/ocular/óptico*, *dedo/dactilar/digital* and so many others in which the adjective is of a cultural type. On the other hand, the limits are difuse: a technical term may become common, and vice versa.

409. Graeco-Latin elements are often used with new meanings, as we have seen with regard to *foto-*. This is inevitable when we are dealing with new professions, as in cases such as *-nauta (cosmonauta, aeronauta, astronauta)*. What would the Greeks have said about these words or about *hemeroteca, videoteca, cinemateca, taxímetro*, or *dinamómetro*? And who would ever imagine that *ión* comes from the pres. Part. of the verb εἶμι? The same is true in the case of suffixes and prefixes, as we have seen: for example, in chemistry *-ico* and *-oso* (*sulfúrico/sulfuroso*) take specific values. Greek and Latin prefixes and suffixes sometimes become synonymous and try to occupy the same field (for instance, *sidoso/sidático*), sometimes they become specialised (Gr. *-ma* is favoured to Lat. *-men* in linguistic and medical terminology, and a distinction is drawn between *hipermercado* and *supermercado*).

410. Also, the types of formation are often different from the ancient ones and very unorthodox from the point of view of Greek and Latin: the *Utopia* by Tomas Moro was rather unorthodox, and today, true monstrosities are sometimes created. Very often, as we have seen, not only are Graeco-Latin hybrids created, but also hybrids of the modern language and Greek or Latin suffixes (*naturismo/naturista, turismo/turista*, of French origin). Yet the systems are optional, not compulsory (there is no **nazista, *bandolerista*).

On the other hand, the small lexical systems of Modern Greek-Latin are, in principle, the same as those we have seen within Greek and Latin, but they occasionaly exceed themselves in creating more than one noun/adjective/verb/adverb system from the same root;

and with greater or lesser symmetry or asymmetry with respect to the parallel systems. And many forms are only used in composition.

So, from φωνή we obtain the nouns *-fonía* (*zampoña* < συμφωνία is an old Romance word which was left out of the system), *fonema, fonética* (substantivisation); the adjectives *-fono* (substantivised from *teléfono*), *fónico, fonético, fonemático* and neither verbs nor adverbs; all with various semantic specialisations within the different scientific fields.

From πάθος we obtain: the nouns *-pata, -patía, patólogo, patología*; the adjectives *-pático, patético, patológico*. From πλάσσω: the nouns *plasma, -plastia, plasta, plástica, plástico*; the adjective *plástico;* the verb *plasmar*. In short, the situation of irregularities and lacunae found in the system in Greek continues here, within a growing volume of lexicon. But the expansion of the various formations and their semantic diversification is steadily increasing.

411. The truth is, a systematic study of the cultural lexicon with a Graeco-Latin base has never been attempted: today it is possible thanks to the new information systems of databases and data processing. But, of course, we can still count on studies such as those cited in § 389: works by R. Lapesa, M. Fernández-Galiano, F. Brunot, A. Ewert, A. C. Baugh, F. Fernández, W. Stammler, B. Migliorini, H. Lüdtke, J. Berguz. The direct study of dictionaries is particularly significant. We shall refer later to the DRAE, the *Dictionary of the Royal Spanish Academy (Real Academia Española)* 2001, and that of C. Eseverri and J. F. González Castro, previously cited; also, to the inverse Spanish dictionary by I. Bosque–M. Pérez Fernández 1987.

For the problems of scientific and technical language, cf. Adrados 1973b, 1986b and 1997b (with bibliography) and M. A. Martin Zorraquino 1997. For the lexical systems in general, see Adrados 1969, I, p. 490 ff., E. Coseriu 1977; for some concrete lexical systems in Spanish, see Adrados 1995. For the quantifying of this lexicon, K. Psomadakis 1995 (and the data that I extract directly from various sources).

412. In fact, these nuances, which could be extended almost indefinitely, do not negate the central importance in our languages of the stratum of the cultural and scientific language which we have called Greek-Latin. This stratum is a practically international continuation of scientific Greek and Latin, without which today we could hardly speak in terms of culture and science.

It has totally renovated the languages which were formed in the Middle Ages from the old Indo-European languages and others, bringing them closer together. We are dealing with a Graeco-Latin cultural universe, which is more alive today than it ever was. Thus, Greek and Latin continue to be living languages in the present day.

As an example, let us try to quantify in some measure the impact of this type of language in modern Spanish. I say 'as an example' because the circumstances are strictly comparable in other European languages and because, as I mentioned before, exhaustive studies on this subject do not exist.

Eseverri's dictionary of Spanish Hellenisms, already outdated and incomplete, serves as a starting point (it contains some 17,000). If we compare the 2,500 Latin Hellenisms collected by Weise, we can see that the number has increased considerably. And it continues to do so: the proposal for new words presented to the plenary sessions of the Royal Spanish Academy *(Real Academia Española)* by the Technical Vocabulary Commission *(Comisión de Vocabulario Técnico)*, contains hundreds and hundreds of words which are, for the most part, Hellenisms or formations with elements from Greek lexicon. To be sure, in the recently published (1998) collection of emmendations and additions to the *DRAE* (only for the letters *a* and *c*), words with a Greek base appear in a very great number. For example: there are 6 with *acro-*, 10 with *aero-*, 17 with *anti-*, 12 with *bio-*, 14 with *cat(a)-*, 13 with *cine-*.

These elements are Spanish proper, and they join for the most part with Spanish words: *antiimperialismo, antiniebla, antinuclear, antipartícula,* etc. (but also *antihelmíntico, antipatía, antípoda,* etc., with Greek elements, *antihiático, antimisil,* etc. with Latin elements).

Importance for the Spanish lexicon

413. The importance of these elements for the Spanish lexicon can be seen by studying the *DRAE.* In my article Adrados 1997b I indicate, for example, that there are some 100 words with *auto-*, 80 with *hiper-*, 25 with *filo-*; there are also abundant Latinisms with *circum, hiper,* etc.

I have studied a list, made by the Institute of Lexicography of the Royal Spanish Academy *(Instituto de Lexicografía de la Real Academia Española)*, containing prefixes or initial formative elements that appear in the *DRAE* – some 200 – and the proportion of Hellenisms and Latinisms is astonishing: about 95 percent. In the first page, which contains 48, there are 22 Hellenisms: *a-, aden-, adeno-, aero-, alo-, an-, ana-, anarco-, anfi-, aniso-, anti-, antropo-, arce-, archi-, arqui-, arz-, auto-, baro-, biblio-, bio-, bradi-, cata-* (we can see that sometimes there are variants of the same element). Alongside this, we have 22 Latinisms

and 4 elements of other origins. In other pages, the proportion of Hellenisms is even greater.

This means that Greek-Latin covers all of the cultural language and is a fundamental element of Spanish. But not just the prefixes. In the *Diccionario inverso de la lengua española* by I. Bosque–M. Pérez Fernández 1987, we find, as I indicate in the article cited, around 600 words with *-tico,* 50 with *-sico-*, 800 with *-ismo,* 11 with *-asmo.* These are just some samples.

The study of the *DRAE* list leads to analogous conclusions with respect to suffixes: whether from Greek (like those mentioned and others) or from other origins: Latin (*-ario, -ano,* etc.), originating from the former or latter (*-ia, -ico,* etc.), or from Spanish (*-able, -ador,* etc.). The Greek element is strong, although not as much as in the prefixes. It is also strong in the second terms of compounds (which sometimes also appear in the first): see series such as *-filo, -fobo, -fugo, -génesis, -genia, -geno, -gono, -grafía, -grama, -hídrico, -iatría*; or such as *-plastia, -podo, -ptero, -rragia, -rrea, -rro, -scopia, -scopio, -statico, -teca, -tecnica, -termo, -tomía, -tomo, -trofia, -trofo.*

Note that in these relations we are only dealing with Greek elements (and Latin elements such as *-cultura, -forme*) of more frequent use, which have been assimilated into Spanish and have practically become part of it. From this, we can deduce that our qualification of the modern languages of Europe as semi-Greek or crypto-Greek is not an exaggerated one.

414. Another resource for evaluating the importance of the cultural language is the study of the growth of the lexicon through the centuries. In a report presented recently to the Royal Spanish Academy, the proportion of words that have entered in each historical period is established, based on a study of 1,000 pages of the *Diccionario Historico de la lengua Española.* These periods are:

The Middle Ages (until 1501), 1,060 (14 percent).
The Golden Age (until 1701), 1,148 (15.4 percent).
The eighteenth-twentieth centuries, 5,242 (70.3 percent).

This impressive increase is mainly due to the cultural and scientific vocabulary and derivatives within Spanish, created according to tendencies of this vocabulary. It is clear that in passing from Latin to Castilian, the lexicon had been extremely reduced, with very few abstracts and hardly any derivatives and lexical paradigms. Only the

cultural lexicon of Greek-Latin, and that created in its likeness, was able again to produce a rich and flexible language with a broader lexicon than Latin.

Similarly, an impoverished syntax gave way to a more flexible and rich syntax which was able to express abstract thought. Again, through imitation of the ancient models: Latin syntax, which had developed under the influence of Greek syntax.

An international character

415. We have repeatedly indicated that we are dealing with a general phenomenon, which is not restricted to Spanish. I would like to confirm this by referring to a study by K. Psomadakis 1995, already cited in § 411, in which he summarises Greek words and formative elements (or of Greek origin) in seven European languages. The first is Modern Greek, which has often received these words from other European languages, without this affecting its original Greek character.

The first part of this study draws a list of 120 words of the cultural and scientific language which are almost identical in the seven European languages in question: Greek (modern), Russian, English, French, German, Italian and Spanish. This is the case in the word *democracy* (cf. § 436).

It is impossible to treat these 120 words and their seven versions here, so I will limit myself to the beginning of the list in Spanish (alphabetisation is according to Greek, naturally): *estética, etiología, alegoría, amnistía, anemia, análisis, anarquía, anécdota, aritmética, harmonía, arqueología, astronauta, atmósfera, átomo, autómata, barómetro, base, bibliografía, biología, galaxia, genética, geografía, decálogo, democracia, demagogia, diagnosis, dieta, diálogo, diámetro, diafragma.*

The second part of the study draws a list of a series of compositive elements which are considered to be common to these languages (I will also give these in Spanish, the correspondences are obvious):

> Initial elements: (a) prepositions, *anfi-, ana-, anti-, apo-, cata-, dia-, ec-, en-, hiper-, hipo-, meta-, para-, peri-, pro-, sin-;* (b) numerals, *mono-, proto-, di-, tri-, tetra-, penta-, pento-, hexa-, hepta-, octo-, deca-, dodeca-, hecto-, kilo-;* (c) nouns, adjectives and adverbs, *aero-, astro-, auto-, bio-, cromo-, crono-, dis-, ecto-, electro-, endo-, eu-, exo-, geo-, gramo-, hemo-, hemato-, hetero-, holo-, homo-, homeo-,*

hidro-, higro-, iso-, macro-, micro-, meso-, neuro-, nefro-, orto-, paleo-, pan-, pango-, filo-, fono-, foto-, poli-, pseudo-, psico-, tele-, termo-, uro-, xero-, zoo-.

Final elements: (a) suffixes, *-oide, -ista, -ico, -ismo, -osis*; (b) nominal elements, *-cracia, -gnosis, -gnóstico, -grafía, -gráfico, -lógico, -logía, -metro, -métrico, -metría, -morfo, -mórfico, -morfismo, -nauta, -patía, -patético, -fono, -fónico, -fonía, -plasma, -plasia, plastico, -rrea, -scopio, -scopia, -topo, -tópico, -tropo, -trófico, -trofia.*

416. In most cases, we are just dealing with examples. But I believe that, given the aforementioned data, the act of including the life of Greek in other languages in the history of Greek is justified. This stratum belongs to these languages, but it is at the same time international and also Graeco-Latin. It is an entirely living stratum which is constantly developing.

Thus, Greek not only provided the model for scientific vocabulary and prose, but also survived to the present day in very diverse languages, actively serving this vocabulary. It is not just a fossil element or one among other elements: it is an element whose history still continues.

CHAPTER FOUR

MODERN GREEK

1. The history of Modern Greek (MG)

417. The Greek language has always provided surprises: in Ancient Greece, its differentiation and then unification through the convergence of literary and political factors; subsequently, in the Roman period, its uninterrupted existence in the East under Roman rule; and in Byzantium, its continuity as the language of the Church and State. And then, of course, its 'invasion' of all languages, making them suitable for the development of culture and science.

Finally, after the fall of Byzantium and the Turkish period, Greek was resurrected in the form of two sociolinguistic strata and a myriad of dialects; it then unified them, around Athens, as in Antiquity, and in a somewhat parallel manner.

Somehow, the language of a small group of people had managed, in extremely unfavourable circumstances, not only to survive and achieve unity twice, but also to become the model which all languages would follow.

Here, we shall deal with its last adventure: the creation of Modern Greek.

418. We have seen how, during the Turkish period, only certain marginal dialects of the Ionic islands (which were never occupied permanently by the Turks), and of Cyprus and Crete (which maintained their independence for a time), were cultivated in a literary way. In the occupied zone, continental Greece, the dialects which emerged had, with few exceptions, a purely oral character.

The Church, upon which the Greeks based their sense of identity, made use of the Atticist language. The previously mentioned attempts made in the Byzantine period, to use popular language in literature (only in very concrete genres and without a mixture of old elements) were abandoned.

This brings us back to the subject of the two Greek linguistic strata. We have seen that in the periods of the Byzantine and Roman

empires, there had been two languages which had a reciprocal influence on each other: spoken or popular language and literary or Atticist language. Indeed, in modern Greece, from the liberation onwards, there has been a rivalry between these two languages, known respectively as καθαρεύουσα 'pure' and δημοτική 'popular', the former being derived from Atticist Greek and the latter from popular or spoken Greek. A. Hatzidakis, in his book of 1892, established the genealogy of MG as descending from the old *koine*, and not, in general terms, from the old dialects. The Modern Greek dialects, whose origins have been discussed, also descend from *koine* (although these dialects may have inherited features of the old dialects, see § 440).

The history of MG resumes with an evolutionary tendency: the disappearance of the two linguistic strata and of the different dialects in favour of a single, almost unified MG (which has also, of course, received influences from different languages).

MG has reduced its scope to a relatively reduced geographical area, close to that of AG (Ancient Greek). It occupies nearly all of Greece, where 95 percent of the population speak it (more than 10,000,000 people) and the Greek part of Cyprus (some 600,000 people). In Greece, the number of Slavic, Armenian, Albanian and Rumanian speakers has diminished drastically and the majority are bilingual; Ladino or Judeo-Spanish practically disappeared after the persecutions of the Second World War. There are about 150,000 Turkish speakers left in Thrace.

Besides this, the number of Greek speakers in Egypt (Alexandria) and Asia Minor has diminished incredibly as a result of anti-western backlash: the lost war in Anatolia and the exchange of population groups (1923), nationalist regimes in Egypt (from 1956). Their number has decreased in Istambul. These Greeks, and those of the Caucasus and Ukraine, have withdrawn to Greece. By contrast, there are flourishing Greek communities in western Europe, America and Australia.

419. For the bibliography relating to MG in general (until 1972), cf. D. V. Vayacacos 1972. The linguistic study of MG was initiated by A. Hatzidakis in his book of 1892, *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, and was continued by other works outlined in our bibliography. Here, one can also find references to the grammars and linguistic studies of J. Psichari 1886–89, A. Thumb 1895, H. Pernot 1921 and A. Mirabel 1959a as well as the works of M. Triandaphyllidis, whose *Grammatikí* of 1941 had a profound

influence. See also F. W. Householder and others 1964, O. Elefteriadis 1985 and (today, the more complete *Grammatikí*) A. Tsopanakis 1994. For the various areas of grammar, see H.-J. Seiler 1952, A. Koutsoudas 1962, P. H. Matthews 1967 and D. Sotiropoulos 1972; for the lexicon, see P. Mackridge 1985, p. 307 ff. and § 432 ff.

For the most essential points regarding the history of MG, the 'linguistic question' in Greece and the state of the current language see: in this work, p. 70 ff., and in R. Browning 1983, p. 100 ff., D. V. Vayacacos 1972, p. 81 ff. and P. Mackridge 1985, p. 1 ff. See also, on these subjects, A. E. Megas 1925–27, A. Mirambel 1937, 1957 and 1959, V. Rotolo 1965, C. D. Papadatos 1976, E. Petrounias 1978, G. Babiniotis 1979, R. Brown 1982, S. C. Caratzas 1957–58, I. P. Walburton 1980 and G. Horrocks 1997, p. 334 ff.

420. Greek managed to maintain its prestige in the East in the Turkish period, despite the terrible blows it received. A small élite regarded it as the descendant of the glorious past; many more regarded it as the language of the true religion, centered on the patriarchy of Constantinople. Here and in other parts of the Turkish empire, there were many Greek speakers who were generally tolerated although there were periods of persecution. Indeed, a small Greek aristocracy held official posts in the empire, particularly the Phanariots of Constantinople, who held important administrative and political posts and governed Walachia and Moldavia for the Sultan.

In the West, however, the only reference for Greek was Classical Antiquity. In its name (or using it as a pretext), Frederick II of Prussia rejected Voltaire's proposals to help liberate the Greeks from the Turks. The Greeks were considered undeserving, debased, and their language corrupt. An exception was Catherine of Russia, no doubt because of the deep bonds between her country and Byzantine culture.

However, towards the end of the century, after the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, efforts to help the Greeks slowly began to grow, as they became identified more or less with the ancients: for example, Lord Byron and the Philhellenes who fought in the Greek war of liberation from 1821 onwards. This was complemented by the fact that the Greeks, who were subjects of the Turkish empire, began to relate to Europe as partners in foreign trade or as members of the Greek communities which were being formed in Russia and the West. Also, by the diffusion of European ideas of independence and freedom, whose ancient genealogy was admitted by all.

Under liberal and nationalistic influence, groups of Greek immigrants promoted the creation of independence groups in Greece and abroad (in Odessa and in the West), which were supported by the Phanariots of Constantinople and the Greek Church.

On the other hand, Greece was a good support base for the Russians and westerners in their desire for expansion at the expense of the Turks. All of this resulted in aid to the Greeks when they tried to liberate themselves from the Turks. The events unfolded as follows: the revolt of 1821, a war with disputable results; the support of Great Britain, Russia and France (the treaty of London and the battle of Navarino, 1827); Greek independence (the treaty of Adrianopolis of 1829 and the London Conference of 1830).

421. Greece thus found itself liberated, but there was still the linguistic issue. The minority that was able to write did so in καθαρεύουσα (KG), the continuation of the old, Byzantine *koine*; the rest spoke δημοτική (DG), divided further into dialects, a language which was not written. The western model and a little rationality required a single language, a language that would also be capable of satisfying the needs of European civilisation. But how would this be achieved?

The task was undertaken by Adamantios Korais (1748–1833), a Greek from Smyrna who had been sent to Amsterdam by his father as a commercial representative, and had later studied medicine at the University of Montpellier. He had lived through the French Revolution and saw in the expedition to Egypt the beginning of the end of the Ottoman empire. In his last years, he witnessed the liberation of Greece.

Korais was an excellent classical philologist. He began by translating Strabo, at Napoleon's request, and later translated and edited (with numerous notes) the classical authors: Aristotle, Plato, Thucydides, Isocrates, and many others.

He considered Greek as a continuum, believing that Polybius, Plutarch, and the rest had followed the pronounciation of Modern Greek. Yet, if, for Korais, δημοτική was the continuation of Ancient Greek, he wanted to 'purify' it, by adding some elements of the old language in order to convert it into a language of culture, administration, and education. He was treading an intermediate territory between the pure δημοτική and the 'pure' language advocated by the more traditional sector, led by Codrikás, a representative of the Phanariots of Constantinople.

For example, against the demotic ψάρι 'fish', he proposed its etymological form ὀψάριον, whereas Codrikás wanted to return to the AG ἰχθύς.

The poets of the Ionic islands were more radical. These islands were the only place where a dialect continued to be cultivated in written form, after the conquest of Cyprus and Crete by the Turks. We have mentioned the poet Solomós, the most well-known of the group. But it was a local language and now, attempts were being made to create a national language suitable for administration and prose in general.

422. In these circumstances, a provisional government was established in Nauplion in 1828, and later, in 1833, the capital was moved to what really was a small city but with an illustrious name, Athens. The classicist interpretation prevailed (although making Athens into a monarchy was hardly classical) and the city became filled with neoclassical buildings. This orientation also prevailed with regard to language.

However, from the outset, the hard facts of reality began to impose themselves. Together with the Athenians, an influx of foreign peoples, mainly Peloponnesian, invaded the small city of Athens. A spoken dialect began to form, which was more or less common, based on 'southern Greek', more conservative than that of the North but with certain archaisms proceeding from the dialect spoken in Attica, Megara and Aegina. It had (and still has) the forms ἄνθρωπος (not ἄνθρουπους), μύτη 'nose' (not μύτ), μεσημέρι 'midday' (not μισμέρ). It accepted some features from the Greek of the Ionic islands (Ac. pl. fem. τις of the article) and Constantinople.

However, once the Greek government had been installed, pressure from classicism was very strong, so that the καθαρεύουσα underwent a renovation and was taken a step further. There were certainly extremists (such as P. Soutsos, who attempted to renovate old Attic) and moderates (such as K. Asopios). On the other hand, there was also hypercorrection and the creation of new words: instead of κάσσα 'box', χρηματοκιβώτιον was used; instead of πατάτα, γεώμηλον (a calque from Fr. *pomme de terre*).

The Demotic language (DG) was referred to as 'long-haired' and riots broke out in Athens when, in 1901, A. Rallis published a translation of the New Testament into DG (he had previously translated the *Iliad*).

423. Nevertheless, the situation had begun to change in 1888 when J. Psicharis, a Greek writer who lived in Paris, published his novel Τὸ ταξίδι ('My voyage') in DG. He attempted to create a regularised Demotic (too regularised), which admitted, it is true, literary words from KG. Yet, in spite of everything, the language of journalism, law, and science continued to be KG, and until 1909 it was the only language taught in the schools.

Gradually, however, it began to lose the most extreme features of Atticism: the old Greek future, the optative, Attic declension, imperatives in -θι. But the 1911 Constitution still considered GK the official language of Greece.

Nevertheless, the renovation became stronger when, in 1910, M. Triandaphyllidis founded the association known as the 'Education Society' ('Εκπαιδευτικὸς Ὅμιλος). This body influenced the legislation of the Liberal Party of E. Venizelos, who in 1917 introduced DG into elementary education. The language advocated by Triandaphyllidis was described in his *Grammar* of 1941, which was a kind of prescriptive linguistics.

Certainly, his conception was more open than that of Psicharis: it preserved certain double forms and purist forms, such as -πτ- instead of -φτ- in words of ancient origin (περίπτερο). But, unfortunately, the linguistic 'issue' became politicised, and the supporters of DG were at times accused of pro-Russian and even pro-Bolshevik sympathies.

From 1923 to 1964 DG continued to be the language of the first levels of school education (except during the government of Tsaldaris in 1935–36); in 1964, the Centre Party placed both languages on an equal footing, although DG was rarely studied by students older than 14. Later, during the government of the Coronels, KG was once again declared the official language (1969), DG being restricted to the first four levels of primary education. There was a reaction against this with the change of regime: in 1976, DG was declared the official language of education and administration.

Subsequently, the triumph of the PASOK party saw the introduction of the so-called monotonic system in 1982: an orthographic reform which abolished the *spiritus*, allowed monosyllables to be written without accents (with exceptions) and polysyllables with only an acute accent.

424. However, the path towards the imposition of DG turned out to be longer than expected. For a long time, and despite everything,

KG, liberated from extremisms, continued to be the language of the tribunals, army and Church. It was the language of culture, while DG slowly began to be imposed (from genre to genre) and with errors, producing an often artificial and confused prose. This situation was only made worse by the decline in the standard of teaching of the classics and by new pedagogical trends which constantly lowered the level of the students.

All the same, DG now triumphs in Greece. But rather than Demotic, we should simply call it, at least in its written form, Common Greek. Indeed, there are various types of DG, among them the so-called καθομιλουμένη, with abundant elements of καθαρεύμουσα which were culturally indispensable. Consequently, what we normally refer to as Modern Greek (MG) is not exactly unitary: it preserves elements of the ancient language in its phonetics and morphology, and especially in its lexicon. There is πόλη/πόλις (G. -ης or -εως), -ότα/-ότης, G. of the first declension in -α (modern)/-ης (ancient), δεσποινίδα/δεσποινίς, Ἑλλάδα/Ἑλλάς; the N. pl. of the first in -αι (τουρισταί) is sometimes preserved; from the adj. βαθύς there is G. sg. βαθιοῦ/βαθέος, N. pl. βαθιοί/βαθεῖς. And there are still many compositive elements of AG, as well as infinite variations which are more or less synonymous in the lexicon, of the type κόκκαλο/ὀστοῦν 'bone'. The language we call MG therefore combines different varieties of DG.

2. Description of Modern Greek

425. Thus, a new *koine*, which is Modern Greek, was created and diffused, amid the debates of the proponents of diverse official interventions and solutions. It is not entirely uniform (although neither was the ancient *koine*), but it is fundamentally based on a dialect, as the old *koine* had been: in Peloponnesian Greek, in this case. A new element has been added: the resolution of the inherited diglossia, which had become increasingly aggravated. Also, the absorption of lexical elements from the western languages, which shall be discussed later.

The principal characteristics are known to us from the DG of various Byzantine texts, particularly from the twelfth century onwards (and in later dialects of Cyprus and Crete, among others). We have discussed these. But it is useful to present an overview of DG as a whole, adding data on KG.

426. *Phonetics*. The following characteristics are found: iotacism and the elimination of diphthongs, which provokes various graphias of the same phoneme; the elimination of the opposition of short and long vowels (but there are two graphias of ο), of the accent of intensity, and of the two old tonal accents; a system of voiceless and voiced occlusives and fricatives, in the three points of articulation, with graphic distinction; an opposition of the sibilants σ/ζ, also in certain contexts of voiceless/voiced σ; of the affricates τσ, τζ; the loss of -ν (except before occlusives and affricates, but sometimes preserved in KG); χτ, φτ (sometimes κτ, πτ in KG); the palatalisation of consonants before ι (*y*); and a fixed accent in adjectives (νεώτερη, but not in KG).

427. *Noun and adjective*. The noun has a simplified morphology, with the three cases of N., G. and Ac. (rarely a separate V.) and the two numbers sg. and pl. There are isosyllabic words of two types: the first, with two forms in sg. and another two in pl. (masc. sg. N. πατέρας/G.-Ac. πατέρα, pl. N.-Ac. πατέρες/G. πατέρων; fem. N.-Ac. καρδιά/G. καρδιᾶς, pl. N.-Ac. καρδιές/G. καρδιῶν, and close types); the second, with three forms in sg. and pl. (masc. sg. N. δάσκαλος/Ac. δάσκαλο/G. δασκάλου, pl. N. δάσκαλοι, Ac. δασκάλους, G. δασκάλων), but two in the neuters (sg. N.-Ac. πρόσωπο/G. προσώπου, pl. N.-Ac. πρόσωπα, G. προσώπων, cf. also μέρος/μέρους/μέρη/μερῶν).

In addition, there are anisosyllabic words, whose masc. and fem. have two forms in the sg. (N./Ac.-G., but there are three in the case of βοριάς), and another two in pl. (N.-Ac./G.), pl. ones having one syllable more thanks to the desinence -δες, which we have discussed. Also, the neuters have two forms with the same distribution and one pl. in -ατα (ὄνομα/ὀνόματα), of ancient origin.

The adjective has generalised the triple inflection masc./fem./n. (with few exceptions). It has maintained three degrees, but the comparative and superlative, together with the synthetic forms of ancient origin, have analytic forms with πιό/ὁ πιό.

As we can see, inflection has been greatly altered and simplified; we saw how in KG ancient desinences are sometimes preferred.

428. *Pronouns and articles*. The pronouns of the 1st person (ἐγώ) and 2nd person (ἐσύ, σύ) continue to exist, while the 3rd is new (the old is αὐτός, 'the same'). The unification of forms in the pl. is notable (N. ἐμεῖς; ἐσεῖς; G. ἐμᾶς, μᾶς; ἐσᾶς, σᾶς) and the preservation, with formal variants, of the old opposition between full forms (1st G.-Ac.

ἐμένα, μένα, 2nd ἐσένα, σένα, among others) and clitics (which are not necessarily atonal, the majority being both enclitic and proclitic): for instance, G. μοῦ, σοῦ, τοῦ (masc.), Ac. μέ, σέ. Only the Ac. το, τη, το, of the 3rd is enclictic and atonal. KG has των as G. pl. of the 3rd, DG has τους.

Some systems are important: the demonstratives αὐτός, τοῦτος, ἐκεῖνος; τετοῖος, τόσος; possessives which are the G. ἐμοῦ, etc.; the reflexives ὁ ἑαυτός μου, etc.; the indefinite κανένας, pl. μερικοί; the interrogatives ποιός, τί, πόσος; the relative πού, without inflection, but also ὁποῖος, ὁποιος, ὅσος, ὅστις (in KG).

In the article, together with the traditional definite article (with slight variations in inflection, fem. pl. N. οἱ, Ac. τίς), there is an indefinite ἕνας.

429. *Verbs*. The most important characteristics have already been mentioned: the reduction to two stems, the second coming from the aorist and perfect, the loss of the dual and optative, and the unification of the indicative and subjunctive in the present stem (not in that of the aorist), the loss of the future (replaced by θα and the ind.), perfect (replaced by a periphrastic form), infinitive (usually, replaced by νά and subjunctive), the participle (made indeclinable in -οντας, -ωντας; but the middle-passive is maintained); an abundance of periphrastic forms. In addition, the old verbal system, although simplified, is essentially maintained: three persons, two voices (the middle voice also acting as a passive), three tenses, three moods (with the imperative), two aspects (opposition extended to the future).

The modifications are above all formal: the reduction of suffixes in the present stem, various ways of forming the aorist stem (we have discussed this), new multi-stem verbs; the middle-passive aorist -θηκα; the loss of atonal augment (but it is maintained in KG); the verb εἰμί inflected as a middle (εἶμαι); considerably altered desinences.

Such alteration is notable and sometimes gives rise to variants. For those that come from AG, there are notable forms such as the act. pres. ind. 2nd sg. λές, ἀκοῦς, πᾶς, 1st pl. δένουμε for δένομε, 3rd δένουν, ἀκοῦνε; impf. 1st sg. ἀγαποῦσα; aor. 2nd sg. ἔδεσες; mid. pres. ind. 1st ἀγαπίεμαι. At times, before new desinences such as mid. 1st pl. -όμαστε, KG preserves the old -όμεθα; in the imperfect, -όμην, -έσο, -έτο can be maintained instead of -όμουν, -όσουν, -όταν. In the imperfect of contract verbs in the active voice, the old forms -ων, etc. can be used in KG instead of -οῦσα, etc., the aorist passive

-θην can be maintained instead of -θηκα, the articular infinitive, etc. But the optative, the old aorist, and future, etc., and a large series of forms have definitively been lost.

430. *Invariable words.* Adverbs are to a large extent those of AG; adverbs in -α predominate over those in -ως, which are maintained particularly in KG.

Prepositions are practically those of AG, sometimes with an altered form: γιά, μέ, σέ (στόν in DG, εἰς τόν in KG), sometimes maintained; there are new prepositions, such as δίχως, χωρίς 'without', σάν 'how', ἴσαμε 'the same as'; they are constructed with the Ac., some with the G. or N. But only some of them function as preverbs (ἀντί, ἀπό, κατά, μετά, παρά, πρός), alongside the old prepositions which alone preserve this function even though they are used as prepositions in ready-made phrases and in KG (διά, ἐκ/ἐξ, ἐν, ἐπί, περί, πρό, ὑπέρ, ὑπό). We should add the preverbs, ξε- (from ἐξ) and ξανα- (also an adverb, from ἐξ-ανα-).

As far as conjunctions are concerned, we must distinguish between coordinating and subordinating conjunctions. The former are not very different from those of AG: copulative καί; disjunctive ἤ . . . ἤ . . ., εἴτε . . . εἴτε . . ., οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . ., μήτε . . . μήτε . . . The importance of the latter has grown since the disappearance of the infinitive, as well as the genitive absolute. Apart from relative clauses with πού and other relatives, already mentioned, there are clauses of completives ὡς, θώς and ὅτι (particularly in KG), interrogatives with τί, causal and temporal with γιατί, ἀφοῦ, ἐπειδή, ἐνῶ, διότι, consecutives with ὥστε, finals with ἵνα, γιά νά, those of fear with μή, μήν, those of mood with καθώς, σάν, etc.

431. *Suffixes, lexicon.* Suffixation closely resembles that of AG, but there are far more suffixes, whether new (some of foreign origin, as we saw), or ancient: from abstracts such as -σιμο (τρέξιμο 'race'), -ητό (φαγητό 'meal'), -ούρα (σκοτούρα 'confusion'), -εία, -ειά (δουλειά 'work'); from diminutives such as -άκι, -ίδι, -ούλα and augmentatives such as -άρα, -άρος; from ethnics such as -άνος, -ίνος, -έζος; from the derivation of adjectives taken from nouns such as -ακός, -άρης, -άτος or other adjectives such as -ούλης (ἀσπρούλης) or verbs such as -ερός (θλιβρός). In § 334 we saw the preferred suffixes for verbs from the Byzantine period onwards.

The important thing is that the richness of derivation and composition is preserved, functioning in a way similar to that of Ancient Greek, but with constant innovation.

The lexicon continues that of AG to a large extent, but it has been renovated; we shall deal separately with this subject, for it is an area in which foreign influence has been considerable. It serves to draw attention to the existence of a DG lexicon that is different from that of KG, whose terms, nevertheless, occasionally can be introduced in DG. Examples of pairs with the opposition DG/KG are the following (some were mentioned previously): ἕνας/εἷς 'one', μεγάλος/μέγας 'big', κόκκαλο/ὀστοῦν 'bone', ψάρι/ἰχθύς 'fish', μύτη/ῥίς 'nose', νερό/ὕδωρ 'water', etc.

3. Borrowings and culture words in the Modern Greek lexicon

432. We have seen how, in the history of Greek, the partial difference between DG and KG presented the greatest obstacle for unification. Later, however, many words from KG, along with the lexical base of DG, would aid in the formation of MG. Greek has absorbed many borrowings from other languages, among them western borrowings (sometimes of Greek origin) which have enabled it to become incorporated into the universal cultural and scientific movement.

This was a late incorporation, given that Greece had not participated in the movement of Humanism and modern science because of Turkish domination. Yet, the facility of its language for derivation and composition, inherited from the Ancient language, made this incorporation possible: it easily admitted lexical elements of Ancient Greek origin or those derived from them.

Note that the 'new' words are abundant in the popular language today, whereas we can write about abstract or scientific subjects with a vocabulary that is practically that of Ancient Greek with forms derived from it.

According to the statistics presented by P. Mackridge and extracted from van Dijk-Wittop Koning, 324 out of 1,148 words studied by this author are words from AG which have remained unchanged in form and meaning; 148 are substantially the same, with some changes in morphology or phonetics (λίγος for ὀλίγος, θέτω for τίθημι); 129 are words from AG that have been 'resuscitated' in modern time; 202 are words derived from AG from the fourth century BC onwards (συνεχίζω, ἀκατάπαυστος, etc.); 252 are words derived in modern time from others coming from AG; only 50 words are true borrowings.

433. On the Modern Greek lexicon in general and its problems, see P. Mackridge 1985, p. 306 ff. On borrowings of various origins, A. Tsopanakis 1994, p. 629 ff. For the borrowings from Slavic, Albanian and Rumanian, G. Meyer 1894; for borrowings from Turkish, K. Kazazis 1972; and from French, A. A. Papadopoulos 1926 and N. G. Kontospoulos 1978. For a fuller bibliography (until 1972), see D. V. Vayacacos, p. 215 ff.

434. Greek continues to have many words of Latin origin, taken in loan in different periods: ἀκουμβῶ < *accumbo*, ἄσπρος < *asper*, βραχιόλι < *bracchiolum*, κάστρο < *castrum*, etc. The majority of these words have adapted to the Greek system of inflection and from them very productive suffixes are obtained, such as -άρω, -άνος, -ούλι.

Greek maintains many words of Italian origin, mostly Venetian, such as βόλτα, γοῦστο, καραμέλα, κοστούμι, κουζίνα, μπαστούνι, σαρδέλλα, ταρέτσα, τσιμέντο, etc. These are assimilated into the Greek lexicon and its inflection. They are a product of medieval contacts with the peoples of Italy, in some cases also in the modern period.

A series of borrowings are a product of the occupation by neighbouring peoples and from other contacts. Rumanian borrowings are quite frequent: βελέντζα 'cloak', γκαβός 'blind man', etc. Slavic borrowings are numerous: βαγένι 'barrel', λούτσα 'marsh', ροῦχο 'dress', etc. There are also Russian borrowings, some are old, but others date from the eighteenth century (μπαλαλαίκα, μουζίκος, etc.), and some Albanian borrowings (κοκορέτσι, a kind of 'hen guts', πιάτσικο 'armed incursion', etc.) and Arabic borrowings (καραβάνι, μαγαζί, σαφάρι, etc.).

But this is not as important as the Turkish vocabulary that was left in Greece, especially relating to material objects, food, dress, hierarchical ranks, etc.: ἀφέντης, γλέντι 'party', μελιτζάνα 'aubergine', μπακάλης 'shopkeeper', τσάντα 'bag', τσέπη 'pocket'. There are many frequently occurring words, despite efforts to replace them with Greek words; we even encounter formative elements such as the -ογλου of the patronymics.

435. Borrowings from the western languages were the most important in shaping the Greek language: there are very few from Spanish (καννίβαλος, καστανιέτες, πατάτα) and Portuguese (κόμπρα 'snake'), but an abundant number from French; there are also borrowings from English and German.

From French, apart from literary terms and borrowings from the end of the Middle Ages, which we have already considered, we find, among others: ἀγκαζέ < *engagé*, γκαλερί < *galerie*, γραβάτα < *cravate*,

κασκόλ < *cache-col*, λικέρ < *liquer*, μακιγιάζ < *maquillage*, μπλέ < *bleu*, ντεκολτέ < *décolleté*, σοφέρ < *chauffeur*, etc. Very often, they are words from the world of fashion, food, and social life. All of this reflects the enormous French cultural influence in Greece from nineteenth century onwards. These words are routinely left undeclined and are sometimes entirely assimilated (κουλτούρα, πλουραλισμός).

English (and American) terms, apart from derived and compound literary words, mostly refer to the new civilisation and way of life: γκάνγκστερ, γκόλφ, κιλοβάτ, κλάμπ, κλάξον, κομπιοῦτερ, μάνατζμεντ, μπάρ, πιζάμα, στόκ τσέκ, χιοῦμορ, etc. Their phonology adapts badly to Greek, or hardly at all if they are altered: they are transcribed with the original phonetics, with or without inflection. Sometimes, there is an effort to avoid them, by introducing, for example, ὑπολογιστής instead of κομπιοῦτερ, ἐπιταγή instead of τσέκ.

German borrowings are of less significance: μπίρα, σνίτσελ, etc.

436. This vocabulary partly links the Greek people with their eastern neighbours, but insofar as it originates from the West and is of a recent date, it has gradually introduced the Greek people to the world of modern culture. Nevertheless, the entry of what we refer to as Greek-Latin is of greater significance in this field – the lexicon, nearly always formed from derivatives and compounds, and nearly always of a Graeco-Latin origin, which has become the international language of culture and science. We have looked at examples based on the work of K. Psomadakis 1995.

Indeed, these are often words which already existed in AG, and which have returned to MG through French or English: according to Tsopanakis, they can be seen as words which had 'emigrated' and later returned to their native land, sometimes with a change in meaning. Or, as I have pointed out, words formed with elements of AG. Greek has reconstructed its form, eliminating the phonetic or inflectional accidents of the modern languages. From Fr. *anecdote* it has created ἀνέκδοτον, from *necrologie*, νεκρολογία; from Eng. *telephone* it has created τηλέφωνο, from Ger. *Leukämie*, λευχαιμία.

Another of the paradoxes of the Greek language has to be that, after providing the western languages with so many elements, and losing them itself, it later recovered them from these same languages. Thus, it has become incorporated into the field of European languages, previously enriched by Greek, and the culture expressed by them.

Of course, sometimes the recovered ancient words have taken on

a new meaning: ἀλληλογραφία is 'correspondence', and no longer 'writing of *amoebaei* verses', ὑπάλληλος is 'employee'. This is particularly the case when Greek words are created to translate modern vocabulary that is not always entirely Greek: Fr. *automobile* is αὐτοκίνητο, *bicycle* is ποδήλατο, *journalist* is δημοσιογράφος, *université* is πανεπιστήμιο, Ger. *Eisenbahn* is σιδηρόδρομος, *Weltanschauung* is κοσμοθεωρία.

However, we are still left with some errors or imprecisions. Gr. δημοκρατία does not distinguish between 'democracy' and 'republic', ἀτομικός is both 'individual' and 'atomic', κυβερνητικός is both 'governmental' and 'cybernetic'. The new concepts are expressed in Greek with words that used to express other concepts and that cannot be renounced. But problems such as these occur in all languages.

The Greek lexicon thus portrays a bizarre image, filled as it is with all kinds of borrowings and words which may look Greek, but either never existed or, if they did, then with a different meaning. It has not always managed to resist the influence of foreign lexicon which is to a large extent of Greek origin; it has only assimilated it as far as possible. However, Greek has definitively incorporated the same layer or stratum of cultural vocabulary – of definite Greek origin and international through its diffusion – which we have been discussing.

4. The Modern Greek dialects

General considerations

437. We saw in our treatment of medieval Greek how the development of the popular language and, specifically, of the dialects, was produced mainly in places that were distant from the unifying power of Constantinople. Yet, very little is known about the dialects of that period, except for what we have noted about Cyprus, Rhodes, Crete, and the Ionic islands.

Much more is known about the current dialects, which almost invariably arose in similar conditions of isolation, but whose history is for the most part a matter of pure conjecture. It is generally thought that they descend from Byzantine Greek, not from Ancient Greek: this was established by Hatzidakis. But we also find residues of the ancient dialects, see § 440.

438. A general treatment of these dialects can be found, especially, in R. Browning 1983, p. 119 ff., in N. G. Kontosopoulos 1995 and G. Horrocks

1997, p. 299 ff.; also, R. M. Dawkins 1940 and A. Tsopanakis 1994, p. 62 ff. For Tsakonian, see H. Pernot 1934 and S. Caratzas 1976; for Cappadocian, R. Dawkins 1916; for Pontic, D. E. Oeconomidis 1908, A. A. Papadopoulos 1955, D. E. Tobaidis 1988 (and A. Semenov 1935 for the southern Russia); for the dialects of Northern Greece, A. A. Papadopoulos 1927; for the dialect of Cyprus, B. Newton 1972; for that of Crete, A. A. Papadopoulos 1948, N. G. Kontosopoulos 1970, 1980 and 1988 and M. I. Kaukala 1992; for the dialect of Mani, D. V. Vayacacos 1972b; for that of Chios, H. Pernot 1946; for the dialects of southern Italy, G. Rohlfs 1950 and 1962; for that of Cargese, in Corsica, G. H. Blanken 1951. See more references in D. V. Vayacacos 1972, p. 160 ff. and N. G. Kontosopoulos 1994, p. 199 ff. Our current knowledge of the dialects is incomplete; a good part of the bibliography deals with local aspects, vocabularies, etc.

439. The neo-Greek dialects are in decline. On the one hand, this is a result of the increasing diffusion of the modern *koine*, which we call Modern Greek; on the other hand, it is due to the constant retreat of Hellenism, due to the Slavic and Arab invasions at the start of the Middle Ages, the invasions of the Seldjuqs from the eleventh century onwards and the Ottomans in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, to the population movements in our century to which we have referred: the exchange of populations with Turkey in 1923 (and earlier with Bulgaria) and the almost complete disappearance of the Greeks in Alexandria, Constantinople, and southern Russia. These communities found refuge in the Greek continent, particularly in Athens.

Indeed, since Antiquity itself, Greek has become almost eliminated from the ancient colonies in Italy, Sicily, and the West; if any Greek speakers were left, as proposed by Rohlfs and Caratzas as regards southern Italy, it was in abandoned and isolated areas. In Greece itself, the occupation of part of the territory by the Slavs and Albanians during long periods of time and, of course, Turkish rule, gave rise to parallel isolations, to which we attribute the preservation of Laconian features in the Tsakonian dialect, in the S. E. Peloponnese, on the eastern side of Parnon.

Occasionally, the connection between a certain island or place with a certain dialect is attributed to migrations in the Byzantine period: for example, the Greek dialect of Cargese, in Corsica, of Peloponnesian origin (Maniotic, to be more exact), or the fact that the dialect of Samos is of a northern and not sourthern type (due to a migration from Lesbos); or the existence of a Tsakonian colony in Propontis. In Asia Minor, the isolation of Greek communities

during the Turkish period was responsible for the special character of the Pontic dialect, among others (in Cappadocia, Pharasa and Silla); they also received Turkish influence. Analogous circumstances of isolation are responsible for the dialects of southern Russia.

As mentioned above (§ 418), the most widely accepted view, taken from Hatzidakis, is that the *koine* of the Roman and Byzantine periods provides the base for these neo-Hellenic dialects. However, Rohlfs and Caratzas have proposed that in the Greek of southern Italy – some small nuclei centered on Lecce and Bova – residues of the ancient dialects remain: otherwise, it would be impossible to explain their archaisms. Yet, the subsequent invasion by Justinian must have had an influence on the language. Similarly, Tsakonian received elements from *koine*, in addition to Laconian elements.

440. At any rate, this is a much debated subject. After A. Thumb 1885, A. Tsopanakis 1994 has proposed that the northern Greek dialects, characterised by the loss or closure of atonal vowels, were influenced by Thessalian and other Aeolic dialects: this is rather doubtful, for we have no exact date for the differenciation, which in any case appears to be medieval. There is more clarity surrounding the persistence of dialectal archaisms preserved in certain places, especially in dialects of the periphery: this proves that the implantation of *koine* was never as absolute as the literary and epigraphic texts would have us believe. On the other hand, *koine* features which were lost in the later Greek were sometimes preserved in particular places. Here, I give some examples of different kinds of archaisms:

Tsakonian: preserves the digamma (βαννέ < *ἀρνός), also the distinction between long and short vowels (ου for ω, ο maintained) and the Doric α (τὰν ἁμέρα); as in Laconian, it makes θ > σ (σέρος) and loses the σ between vowels (ὁροῦα < ὁρῶσα). It preserves the active ἔμι.

Euboea, Megara, ancient Athens: υ becomes ι, not ιου.
Cyprus, Dodecanese, Pontic, etc.: they retain -ν (Cyp. παιδίν).
Cyprus, Dodecanese, S. Italy: they retain geminate consonants (ἄλλος).
Cyprus, Crete, Rhodes, S. Italy: 3rd pl. in -ουσι.
Pontic and other dialects of Asia Minor: preserve the *e* timbre of the η (as ε), the negation ’κί, the possessives ἐμός, ἐμέτερος.
Pontic, S. Italy: impv. ἄκουσο(ν).

These are just a few examples. They attest to the resistance of the ancient dialects and ancient *koine* in marginal areas to the unifying tendencies, not just with regard to KG, but also DG.

Characteristics of the principal dialects

441. A detailed study of the neo-Hellenic dialects is not pertinent here. The important thing is to establish that these dialects can be divided into two groups, northern and southern; within the latter, we find the archaising and at the same time innovatory dialects we have referred to, and from this group we derive the Demotic dialect which forms the base of Modern Greek.

The two large Greek dialect groups are separated by a line that runs through the entire gulf of Corinth and the Isthmus, climbing north and leaving Attica to the South, continuing through the S. of Euboea, the South of Samos (a recent extension, as we saw, Chios being a southern dialect) and arriving in Asia Minor. Thus, the Greek-speaking regions of Italy, the Ionic islands, Attica, the Peloponnese, and most of the Cyclades (the case of the Greek of Asia is more complicated) comprise the southern dialect; the northern dialect embraces the whole of northern Greece, including Macedonia. This dialect has more innovations. They are mainly phonetic and relate to atonal vowels, as mentioned previously: *e* and *o* become *i* and *u* respectively, while *i* and *u* are lost: ἄνθρουπους, μύτ 'nose', λείπ 'leaves', etc. There is also palatalisation of consonants before atonal ι, fricative pronounciation of *s*, velar *l*, etc. In short, these dialects deviate considerably from the norm and, specifically, from Ancient Greek. As regards the relation of MG with this dialect, which continues to be preserved, it is fortunate that southern Greek has imposed itself, effacing the peculiarities of the marginal dialects. Note that southern Greek has a system of five vowels (as well as that of Crete); northern Greek has one of five vowels in tonic position and one of three in atonal position; and various marginal dialects (Tsakonian, Pontic, Capadocian) have systems of six or seven vowels. They are hardly comprehensible to the speakers of MG.

442. I cannot engage here in a detailed description of the different dialects. Indeed, their classification and mutual relations are often very unclear. But let us note the principle dialects.

In Asia Minor, until the interchange of populations, we find Pontic (in the Black Sea coast, from Inepolis to Athens of the Colchis); in the interior, we find isolated nuclei of Cappadocian and the languages of Pharasa and Silla; Greek dialects were also spoken in Livisa and Makri, on the S. W. coast. On the other hand, we find Pontic dialects in the Ukraine, the most notable being that of Mariupol (whose population came from the Crimea).

We also find Greek dialects in the Cyclades, the Dodecanese, Cyprus, Crete: the last two being particularly dynamic. In Chios, we find three dialectal varieties.

On the continent, mention should be made of the normal Peloponnesian dialect, which differs from the dialects of Mani and Tsakonia; to the N. of the Isthmus, the archicising and already extinct dialects of Athens, Megara, and Aegina; and then there are the living northern dialects of Thessaly, Macedonia, and Thrace, among others.

The dialects of Apulia and Calabria remain to be mentioned, two small nuclei, and the dialect of Cargese in Corsica.

As regards their phonetic, morphological and lexical characteristics, I will not present an overview here, as I have already stated. But perhaps it is useful to provide some loose data, to give the reader a general idea.

In Tsakonian, apart from the archaisms mentioned, there are fricatives instead of occlusives, a σ like the *sh* in English (the fricative š), the κ becomes τσ after a vowel; nouns in -ος are changed to -*e*; there are remnants of participles.

In Cappadocia, Pharasa and Silla, together with archaisms such as the retention of the *e* timbre of the *η*, there is strong Turkish influence, which imposes vowel harmony and the opposition of animated and unanimated nouns. There are coincidences with Greek of the N., for instance atonal *e* > *i*, along with more serious alterations of the consonantal system and, for example, the use of σόν and not στόν. In Pontic, besides archaisms such as the preservation of -ν, we find the fricatives *š* and *ž*, a very open *e* and vocalic features that coincide with the Greek of the N.; the τ and κ are seriously altered (μάτια > μάκια, σκύλλος > τσούλλος). The article is routinely ommitted, the N. in -ος becomes -ον, there is θαφκούνδαν instead of θάμβονται.

The southern type of Cyprian is notable, it preserves -ν (and extends it: πρόγραμμαν) and the geminates; it maintains the 3rd pl. in -συσι, -ασι. But it innovates consonantism: κ becomes the affricate *č* before *e*, *i*; there is also *š* (from χ before *e*, *i*, or σ before *y*) and *ž* (from ζ). In the Cretan dialect, it is notable that the τ is pronounced as θ before *y*, the ντ as δ (μάθια, ἀρχοδιά); and that -νθ- is reduced to -θ- (ἄθρωπος, the loss of the nasal in groups occurs in various dialects). There are variations in the article (τσὶ = τοὺς, τίς), θέλω in the fut. (νὰ φᾶμε θέλει), and νὰ is lost before the verb in the negation context (δὲν ἔχω ποῦ πάω).

Many differences exist from island to island and there are three varieties in Chios, as I stated earlier. For example, in the Masticochora, the χ before *e, i*, is pronounced as a fricative (*š*), σκ before *e* becomes *s*, the ζ becomes ντζ; in Phitá the σ before γ becomes χ (ἐκκλιχιά). In the Cyclades, where the southern dialects dominate, there is one northern dialect in part of Andros and in Tenos; Míkonos is shared between the two.

We know of the situation in the Peloponnese, but we should note that, apart from the anomalous dialect of Tsakonia, there is also that of Mani, which pronounces the κ as τσ (affricate) before *e, i*. It was diffused into Corsica, as mentioned.

As regards the Greek of southern Italy, apart from the archaisms already mentioned, some innovations should be noted. In Apulia, θ and δ are unknown, τ is generally pronounced, as well as σ (τεό, ἀπέσανε) and occlusive *d*; in Calabria, στ is pronounced for κτ, χθ, πτ.

These are just a few notes, mainly phonetic, which would have to be supplemented by multiple data. Palatalisations and fricativisations are, as we can see, routine, as in the Romance languages.

In morphology, one would have to add numerous data relating to declension and, in the verb, to the limitations or exclusions that occur here and there in stems of the present or aorist. Pontic limits aspect to the indicative, Cappadocian only obtains a subjunctive and future from the the aorist, etc.

Dialects and MG

443. Dialects are being lost in Greece by the diffusion of MG through education, means of communication, administration, etc. Of course, the forced migrations from Asia, Constantinople, and Egypt have had an enormous influence: having arrrived in continental Greece with the immigrants, the ancient dialects soon began to decay. The same occurred in the small localities and islands where there was large-scale immigration. In the N. of Greece and the large islands (Crete, Rhodes, Chios), dialects are somewhat better preserved. In the large cities they are lost.

Thus, the centrifugal tendencies which led to the growth of the dialects (of which only a few were given prestige by literature and regarded as fixed dialects), and which had considerable strength at the end of the Byzantine empire and later in places where Turkish power was felt the least or not at all, were extinguished with the creation of the new Greek state.

A new centre had emerged, Athens, which in a first phase attempted to impose KG and in a second phase, gradually accepted a DG tainted with KG: what we refer to as MG or Modern Greek. Greece has always had a strong nationalist and centralist sentiment, probably because of the memory of historical misfortunes and the constant pressure from the Turks and Slavs. This has been reflected, too, in the creation and diffusion, from the dialects just mentioned, of a common language: a language which, based above all on the Peloponnesian dialects, has remained relatively close to AG, without undergoing the vowel and consonantal alterations of other dialects, nor their great morphological innovations. This has allowed for a fluid relation between DG and KG, and the arrival at MG, in which demotic has received, through KG, elements from AG which were indispensible for its transformation into a language of culture.

444. Note that in Modern Greek the vocalic system has remained intact, although the same cannot be said of prosody, accentuation, or the use of diphthongs (the dialects have produced more profound alterations). The consonantal system has not varied too much, although aspirated voiceless consonants have become fricatives and in addition there are other fricativisations (though much less than in the dialects).

The morphological scheme is fundamentally the same as that of AG, although with simplifications not dissimilar from some in the northern Indo-European languages (IIIB) and, within this, from Germanic and Romance languages: the elimination of the dual, the reduction of the causal system (without dative) and the modal (without optative and with a subjunctive with limited use); the elimination of the synthetic perfect and future, the creation of a verbal system based on two stems. Some developments are also comparable to those in other languages: the creation of futures, perfects and other analytic forms, and the opposition of a definite and an indefinite article. MG has created analytic comparatives and superlatives, along with the synthetic.

These were no doubt, as with certain phonetic evolutions, general tendencies of Indo-European, which took some time to reach the different languages; they are also reflected in the history of Indic. By contrast, the disappearance of the infinitive finds a parallel in the Balkan languages (the extension of its use was reduced in Germanic and Romance).

All the same, MG has maintained its inflection, fundamental grammatical categories, derivation, and composition; and it has developed a great capacity to create abstracts, to easily transform certain classes of words into others, and to assimilate foreign lexica (very often of Greek origin). These conditions are all necessary for it to continue being an intellectual language, the inheritor of the ancient language.

Athens has acted as the new Byzantium and its role has not been so different from the role it had in Antiquity. Although, then, we were dealing with a cultural triumph which accompanied and followed a political defeat, whereas here, it is the political role of Athens in Greece which has favoured the unifying tendencies as regards language strata and dialects.

CONCLUSION

445. The remarkable history of the Greek language is an adventurous one, whose writings can be followed across 3,500 years (only Chinese, as we stated, is comparable) and which, through direct or indirect influence, has transformed all European languages, and indeed, all the world's languages, into languages of culture.

Greek began its life as one of the various languages of the last phase of Indo-European. Within this, it belonged to the more archaic southern group which preserved, in the noun and verb, inflections on various stems and had not undergone the inflectional reductions of the northern group. However, this was an innovatory group in various aspects. In short, Greek is a derivative of the group of peoples that, with Persian, Armenian and the Indo-Iranian languages, descended into Greece, Asia Minor, Iran and India: the so-called Indo-European IIIA.

Its first nucleus, Common Greek, was implanted in some area of the Balkans. It was only relatively unitary. Its eastern group descended into Greece towards the year 2000. The western group, much later, towards 1200. From it, two groups derived. The speakers of the eastern group settled on the neolithic and bronze cultures, from which they took many elements; those of the western group (the Dorians) settled partly on top of the speakers of the eastern group. In Greece, both groups tended to become more differentiated and to split internally.

This was the process that we believe East Greek was undergoing during the second millennium. It is probable that a fragmentation was already initiated within it, which tended to distinguish an Aeolic and an Ionic group, and, among them, a group known as Arcado-Cyprian.

In any case, it is clear that two special languages were created in the second millennium: Mycenaean, the language of the bureaucracy of the Mycenaean kingdoms; and Achaean Epic, the language of epic poetry, which was, of course, oral. They had a lot in common with the dialects referred to above, from which the later dialects would emerge; and differentiating features too.

In the first millenium, with the disappearance of Mycenaean, the

fragmentation process of East Greek continued; also of West Greek, now within Greece. Various dialects were created within the groups. Each valley, each small region tended to created its own dialect; even its own alphabet, when, from the ninth century onwards, a new script emerged, derived from Phoenician.

Thus, this is a story of diversification, of an ever greater rupture of unity. It deals with what we call the epigraphic dialects (because it is principally through inscriptions that we know them), although some became literary and in most of them one could write verse inscriptions, influenced by Homeric poetry.

Yet the creation, around the year 1000, of isoglosses that partly unified the eastern and western dialects, or at least most of them, was an event of great significance. After this, diversification continued. The unity of Greek seemed to be definitively lost, although the Greeks considered themselves as the descendants of common ancestors, with a common culture.

446. However, the calling of Greek, after so many adventures, was unity. What is so unique about this is that it should have been achieved through the literary languages.

First, the Homeric language. As the inheritor of old Achaean epic, it absorbed Aeolic and in particular Ionic elements by means of old features which were interpreted as Aeolic or Ionic (from their dialectal assignment in a later date). Indeed, this literary, artificial language was sung and understood in all parts. It thus contributed towards the unity of the Greeks.

Moreover, it strongly influenced the subsequent literary languages which were also international and which received a strong epic and above all Ionic influence. It was received by the language of elegy, iambos, and even by languages with an Aeolic base (the language of the Lesbian poets) and Doric base (the language of choral lyric). Any poet who wrote in any of these genres, whatever his native land, wrote in the language appropriate to the particular genre: these were international languages. All of them contained, first, a strong epic influence; secondly, a strong Ionic influence – especially those we refer to as the 'general' literary languages of elegy, iambos, and even choral lyric.

Thus, Homeric epos was joined with the later literary languages, which were sung and understood everywhere. Ionic was the dominant language, so that when prose arrived in the sixth century – Ionic prose – everyone could write and understand it.

To be sure, Ionic prose was but a forerunner of Attic prose. Athens had become a centre of power and above all the cultural centre of Greece and a place of freedom. The Greek intellectuals, who wrote in Ionic, flocked to Athens. One of them, Gorgias, began to write in Attic, which was not so different. And Attic, because of its cultural force, triumphed everywhere. It was adopted by the Macedonians, who would later conquer Greece. So, Athens may have lost the war, but its conquerors generalised the use of Attic.

This new Attic was *koine*. Thus, there can be no doubt that the literary languages, by means of the last of them, Attic, unified the Greek language. The epigraphic dialects soon disappeared entirely, or almost entirely.

This was the first unification of Greek. It coincided with the promising creation – first in Ionic, later in Attic, and finally in *koine* – of a cultural and scientific language, which was the first of its kind.

Greek spread throughout the East, and to a great extent also in the West, where the sophisticated men of Rome were bilingual. It became the language of the Roman empire in the East.

447. But, after unification came diversification. This occurred with the creation of two strata, corresponding to the popular language and the literary language. This distinction prevailed in the Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine, and Modern periods, almost until the present day. In the case of the literary language, the growing relevance of Greek, which Latin borrowed, was extremely important for the expansion of the cultural and scientific language. This was the Greek-Latin I have referred to, which had such a great influence on so many languages.

From the fourth century AD, Greek was the language of the Roman empire of the East; in the Middle Ages it was the language of the Byzantine empire and the eastern Church. Literary or 'pure' Greek dominated. Not much is known about the popular or demotic Greek and its dialects: it was written rarely and in limited genres, particularly from the twelfth century onwards. But subsequently the Greeks would be dominated by the Slavs, Franks, Venetians, and Turks – a sad state of affairs.

Yet, in the meantime, literary Greek managed to influence the European languages through Ancient and Medieval Latin, and through Byzantine Greek.

448. But when Greece finally lifted itself out of this sad situation by gaining its independence in 1830, Greek was once again fragmented into two sociolinguistic strata and into geographical dialects. It was again the language of Athens that would end up imposing itself, a dialect based on the Peloponnesian dialects without the weaknesses and losses of vowels of the northern dialects, or the palatalisations and other features of the various dialects.

This dialect, the new Attic, would assimilate lexical features particularly from the 'pure language'. Thus, the new Greek was created: the so-called Modern Greek, which is essentially Demotic, but with literary elements. Greek-Latin had a decisive influence on it.

For a second time in the history of Greek, unification had followed a differenciation. And once again, it had occurred in Athens. With one difference: the first time around, a cultural triumph had accompanied a political defeat; the second time around we were dealing with a political triumph which, however, was founded on the memory of ancient Athens.

In each case, by whatever means, Greek managed to become unified. So, it is significant that although in its worst moments, Greek may have been in decline, the educated Greek-Latin language, still managed to invade all the world's languages. Defeated at home, albeit provisionally, Greek went on to conquer the world.

ABBREVIATIONS*

OHG. = Old High German
Ac. = accusative
act. = active voice
adj. = adjective
OSlav. = Old Slavic
OFr. = Old French
OHG. = Old High German
OIn. = Old Indic
OItal. = Old Italian
OSerb = Old Serbian
Ger. = German
ONor. = Old Norse
aor. = aorist
OProv. = Old Provençal
Arc. = Arcadian
Arc.-Cyp. = Arcado-Cypriot
Arm. = Armenian
art. = article
OSerb. = Old Serbian
At. = Attic
atem . = athematic
Austr. = Austrian
av. = avestico
Balt. = Baltic
Balto-Slav. = Balto-Slavic
Bav. = Bavarian
Boeot. = Boeotian
Bulg. = Bulgarian
c. = *circa*
Cat. = Catalan
Celt. = Celtic
Cyp. = Cypriot
Cret. = Cretan
D. = dative
D.-L.-I. = dative-locative-instrumental
decl. = declension
des. = desinence
Dor. = Doric
eg. = example
Aeol. = Aeolic
Sp. = Spanish
fem. = feminine
Fr. = French
Phryg. = Phrygian
fut. = future
E. = East
G. = genitive
AG = Ancient Greek
CG = Common Greek
DG = Demotic Greek
GK = Greek *katharevusa*
MG = Modern Greek
WG = West Greek
EG = East Greek
Goth. = Gothic
Gr. = Greek
Hom. = Homeric
I.-I. = Indo-Iranian
IE = Indo-European
impers. = impersonal
impf. = imperfect

* Abbreviations for the names of authors and works are those of the *Diccionario Griego-Español.*

impv. = imperative
ind. = indicative
inf. = infinitive
Eng. = English
Ital. = Italian
Ion. = Ionic
Ion.-At. = Ionic-Attic
L. = locative
Lat. = Latin
Lesb. = Lesbian
lyr. = lyric
Lith. = Lithuanian
MHG. = Middle High German
masc. = masculine
mid. = middle voice
MFr. = Middle French
Myc. = Mycenaean
MLat. = Middle Latin
mod. = modern
N. = nominative (also North)
N. W. = North West
W. = West
West. = Western
opt. = optative
Pam. = Pamphylian
part. = participle
pas. = passive voice
perf. = perfect
pers. = person
pl. = plural
plu. = pluperfect
Port. = Portuguese
prep. = preposition
pres. = present
pret. = preterite
pron. = pronoun
Prov. = Provençal
S. = South
S. E. = South East
S. W. = South West
sec. = secondary
Serb.-Croat. = Serbo-Croatian
sg. = singular
subj. = subjunctive
them. = thematic
Thes. = Thessalian
Toc. = Tocharian
Voc. = vocative
vulg. = vulgar

BIBLIOGRAPHY

J. Pouilloux et al., 1963: *Archiloque*, Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
A. E. Raubitschek et al., 1968: *L'epigramme grecque*, Vandoeuvres-Geneva.
Istituto lombardo-accademia di scienza e lettere, 1977: *Paleontologia linguistica*, Brescia.
Adrados, et al., 1984 (2nd ed.): *Introducción a Homero*, Barcelona, 2 vols.
AA.VV., 1995: *Les grecs et l'Occident*, Rome.
AA.VV., 1996: *Filhelenismo e tradizionalismo nei primi due secoli dell'impero*, Rome. *Actes de la première recontre internationale de dialectologie grecque*, 1987: in *Verbum* 10, no. 1–3, Nancy.
A.A.V.V., 1999: *Les complétives en grec ancien*, Saint Etienne.
Adiego, I. J., 1993: *Studia Carica*, Barcelona.
Adrados, F. R., 1948: *Estudios sobre el léxico de las fábulas esópicas*, Salamanca.
——, 1952: *La dialectología griega como fuente para el estudio de las migraciones indoeuropeas en Grecia*. Salamanca 1952 (2nd ed., Madrid 1997).
——, 1953a and 1957: 'Sobre los orígenes del vocabulario ático', *Emerita* 21, pp. 123–162; 23, pp. 81–121.
——, 1953b: 'Cómo ha llegado a nosotros la literatura griega', *Revista de la Universidad de Madrid* 1, pp. 527–552.
——, 1955: 'Achäisch, Ionisch und Mykenisch', *IF* 62, pp. 240–248.
——, 1958: 'La vocalización de las sonantes indoeuropeas', *Emerita* 26, pp. 249–309 (in *Estudios sobre las sonantes y larengales indoeuropeas*, 2nd ed., 1973, pp. 3–79, enlarged).
——, 1962: 'Hettitisch und Indogermanisch', in *II. Fachtagung für Indogermanische und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, pp. 145–151, Innsbruck.
——, 1966: *Ilustración y política en la Grecia clásica*, Madrid.
——, 1968: 'Ideas para una tipología del griego', *EC* 54, pp. 25–258 (in *Estudios de Lingüística General*, 2nd ed., Madrid, 1969, pp. 111–135).
——, 1969a: *Lingüística Estructural*, Madrid.
——, 1969b: 'El *Banquete* platónico y la teoría del teatro', *Emerita* 37, pp. 1–28 (in Adrados 1992d, pp. 353–389).
——, 1971: 'Lengua, ontología y lógica en los sofistas y Platón', *Revista de Occidente* 96, pp. 340–355 and 99, pp. 285–309 (in *Estudios de Semántica y Sintaxis*, Madrid 1975, pp. 209–246).
——, 1973a: 'El sistema de Heráclito: estudio a partir del léxico', *Emerita* 41, pp. 1–43 (in *Estudios de Semántica y Sintaxis*, Madrid, 1975, pp. 237–313).
——, 1973b: 'La lengua en la Ciencia contemporánea y en la Filosofia actual', *RSEL* 3, pp. 297–321 (in *Estudios de Semántica y Sintaxis*, Barcelona 1975, pp. 43–67).
——, 1974 (2nd ed.): *Evolución y estructura del verbo indoeuropeo*, Madrid.
——, 1975a: 'Sanskrit and Indoeuropean', in *Proceedings of the first international Sanskrit Conference* 111, New Delhi, pp. 436–444 (Sp. vers. in Adrados 1988a, pp. 421–428).
——, 1975b: *Lingüística Indoeuropea*, Madrid.
——, 1975c: 'La lengua del teatro griego', in *Estudios sobre los géneros literarios*, Salamanca, pp. 29–48.
——, 1976a: 'Micénico, dialectos paramicénicos y aqueo épico', *Emerita* 44, pp. 65–113 (in Adrados 1988a, pp. 429–472).
——, 1976b: 'La creación de los dialectos griegos del primer milenio', *Emerita* 44, pp. 245–278 (in Adrados 1988a, pp. 473–503).

——, 1978: 'Propuestas para una nueva edición e interpretación de Estesicoro', *Emerita* 46, pp. 251–299.
——, 1979–87: *Historia de la fábula greco-latina*, Madrid, 3 vols. (English transl., Leiden, Brill, 1999–2003).
——, 1979a: 'Arqueología y diferenciación del Indoeuropeo', *Emerita* 47, pp. 245–278—(in Adrados 1988a, pp. 19–38; German vers., Innsbruck, 1992).
——, 1979b: review of J. L. García Ramón, 'Les origenes postmycéniennes du groupe dialectal éolien', *Emerita* 47, pp. 471–472.
——, 1980a: 'La teoría del signo lingüístico en un pasaje del *Banquete* platónico', *RSEL* 10, pp. 331–337 (in Adrados 1988b, pp. 61–69).
——, 1980b: 'Les langues slaves dans le contexte des langues indoeuropéennes', in *Supostabitelno ezykosnanie*, pp. 3–14 (Sp. vers. in Adrados 1988a, pp. 541–557.
——, 1980c: *Lírica griega arcaica*, Madrid.
——, (dir.), 1980–2002: *Diccionario Griego-Español*, Madrid (6 vols.).
——, 1981a: 'Towards a new Stratigraphy of the Homeric Dialect', *Glotta* 59, pp. 13–27 (Sp. vers. in Adrados 1988a, pp. 505–518).
——, 1981b: 'Sociolingüística y griego antiguo', *EC* 11, pp. 311–329 (in Adrados 1988b, pp. 34–45).
——, 1982a: 'Neue jambische Fragmente aus archaischer und klassischer Zeit. Stesichorus, Semonides (?), Auctor incertus', *Philologus* 126, pp. 157–179.
——, 1982b: 'The archaic structure of Hittite: the crux of the problem', *JIES* I 1, p. 135 (Sp. vers. in Adrados 1988a, pp. 391–420).
——, 1983a (2nd ed.): *Fiesta, Comedia y tragedia*, Barcelona.
——, 1983b: 'Siria, cruce de caminos de la narrative bizantina y la oriental', *Aula Orientalis* 1, pp. 17–29.
——, 1983c: 'Las categorías gramaticales del griego antiguo', in *Estudios metodológicos sobre la lengua griega*, pp. 85–97, Cáceres (in Adrados 1988b, pp. 139–149).
——, 1984a: 'La dialectología griega', in A. Martínez (ed.), *Actualización Científica en Dialectología griega*, pp. 219–237 (in Adrados 1988a, pp. 519–539).
——, 1984b: *Orígenes de la lírica griega*, Madrid.
——, 1984c: 'Prólogo' to P. Bádenas, *La estructura del diálogo platónico*, Madrid, pp. IX–XI (in Adrados 1992d, pp. 349–351).
——, 1984d: 'The earliest influences of Greek Fable on Medieval Latin Writing', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 35, pp. 243–263.
——, 1986a (2nd ed.): *Orígenes de la lírica griega*, Madrid.
——, 1986b: 'Scientific Language: Instrument and Obstacle. Examples from the Field of Linguistics', in *Wissenschaftssprache und Gesellschaft*, Th. Bungarten (ed.), Hamburg, pp. 13–21 (Sp. vers. in Adrados 1988b, pp. 46–52).
——, 1986c: 'Las fuentes de Hesíodo y la composición de sus poemas', *Emerita* 54, pp. 1–36.
——, 1986d: 'La épica romance a la luz de la épica indoeuropea', in *Actas del Congreso de la Juglaresca*, Madrid, pp. 7–22 (in Adrados 1988b, pp. 309–322).
——, 1987: 'Cultural Contacts between Byzance and the Roman Germanic Empire in the time of Methodius', in *Kirillo-Methodievski Stydii* 4, Sofia, pp. 52–56.
——, 1988a: *Nuevos estudios de Lingüística Indoeuropea*, Madrid.
——, 1988b: *Nuevos Estudios de Lingüística General y Teoría Literaria*, Barcelona.
——, 1988c: 'Sistema y sistemas de los casos en Griego antiguo', in *Homenaje a Maria C. Giner*, Salamanca, pp. 143–147 (in Adrados 1988b, pp. 170–174).
——, 1989a: 'De la *paideía* trágica a la socrático-platónica', in *Paideía y Humanitas*, Santiago de Chile, pp. 119–135 (in Adrados 1992d, pp. 159–182).
——, 1989b: 'Anticipos de una nueva teoría del sistema casual del griego antiguo', in *Actas del VII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos* 1, pp. 23–278, Madrid (in Adrados 1988b, pp. 158–162).

——, 1989c: 'Etruscan as an IE Anatolian (but not Hittite) Language', *JIES* 17, pp. 363–383.
——, 1990a (3rd ed.): *Líricos griegos. Elegiacos y yambógrafos arcaicos*, Madrid.
——, 1990b: 'Sincretismo de casos en micénico?', *Menos* 24, pp. 169–185.
——, 1990c: 'El genitivo temático en -o en micénico y chipriota', in *Studia Indogermanica et Palaeohispanica en honorem A. Tovar et L. Michelena*, Salamanca, pp. 175–181.
——, 1992a: 'La lengua de Sócrates y su filosofía', *Méthexis* 5, pp. 29–52 (in Adrados 1992d, pp. 251–278).
——, 1992b: 'Mito e historia en la Epopeya', in *3er Coloquio de Estudiantes de Filología Clásica*, Valdepeñas, pp. 217–227.
——, 1992c: 'The new Image of Indoeuropean. The History of a Revolution', *IF* 97, pp. 1–28.
——, 1992d: *Palabras e Ideas*, Madrid.
——, 1993: review of M. Papathomopoulos, *Aesopus revisitatus and* Ὁ βίος τοῦ Αἰσώπου *Gnomon* 65, pp. 660–664.
——, 1994a: 'De la literature helenística a la literature latina', in *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, I, pp. 855–862. 1994c: ('More on Etruscan as an IE-Anatolian Language', *Historical Linguistics* 107, pp. 54–76.
——, 1994b (2nd ed.): *Raíces griegas de la cultura moderna*, Madrid.
——, 1994c: *Nueva Sintaxis del Griego antiguo*, Madrid.
——, 1995a: *Sociedad, amor y poesia en la Grecia antigua*, Madrid.
——, 1995b: 'Human vocabulary and naturalistic vocabulary in the Presocratics' *Glotta* 72, pp. 182–195
——, 1995c: 'Problemas léxicos y lexicográficos del español actual', *Donaire* 4, pp. 52–58.
——, 1996a: *Manual de Lingüística Indoeuropea, II. Morfología nomenal y verbal*, Madrid.
——, 1996b: 'Τὰ ἑλληνικά, ἡ πλέον παγκόσμια γλώσσα', in Ελληνική Διεθνής Γλώσσα 7, pp. 275–277.
——, 1996c: 'Esp. acróbata o de cómo quince diccionarios pueden equivocarse', in *Actas del IV Congreso de Hispanistas de Asia*, Seoul, pp. 1–5.
——, 1997a: *Democracia y literatura en la Atenas clisica*, Madrid.
——, 1997b: 'Los orígenes del lenguaje científico', *RSEL* 27, pp. 299–315.
——, 1997c: "More on the Diccionario Griego-Español", en *A Festschrift for Ladislav Zgusta*, Berlín-Nueva York, Mouton-de Gruyter, pp. 221–231.
——, 1998a: 'La reconstrucción del Indoeuropeo y su diferenciación dialectal', in *Manual de Lingüística Indoeuropea*, III, pp. 144–205. Madrid.
——, 1998b: *La 'Dialectología Griega', hoy (1952–1995)*. Madrid.
——, 1998c: 'Navegaciones del siglo VIII, navegaciones micénicas y navegaciones en la *Odisea*' (in Greek) *OMHPIKA*, Ithaca, pp. 13–29.
——, 1998d: and Rodríguez Somolinos, J., 1995–96 [1997]: '*Diccionario Griego-Español* Vol. V', *Museum Criticum* 30–31, pp. 301–317.
——, 1998e: and D. Lara: 'El Vocabulario técnico en el Diccionario Griego-Español', in *Atti del II Seminario . . . sui Lessici*, Messina, pp. 13–25.
——, 1998f: "Escisiones y unificaciones en la historia del Griego", en *Classica Boliviana*, 61–68.
——, 1999a: *Manual de Lingüística Indoeuropea III* (en colaboración), 'La reconstrucción del Indoeuropeo y de su diferenciación dialectal', pp. 249–284.
——, 1999b: 'El εἰμί de Conchita' *Miscelénea léxica en memoria de Conchita Serrano*, Madrid, CSIC, pp. 3–9.
——, 1999c: 'Ambiente y léxico egipcico en Esquilo, *Las Suplicantes*: βᾶρις (839, etc.); σινδονία (121); χάμπσα (878); Ἶσι (848)', in *Eikasmós* 10, pp. 46–55.
——, 1999d: "Hacia una tipologia de las combinaciones de rasgos lingüísticos", en *Language Change and Typological Variation, II*, Washington 1999, pp. 387–396.

——, 2000a: 'Homero y las lenguas poéticas de Grecia como vía hacia la unidad del griego', in *Poesia e religione in Grecia. Studi in onore de G. Aurelio Priviterra*, Perugia, pp. 3–12.
——, 2000b: '¿Cómo describir el Indoeuropeo y sus variantes?', in *Europa et Asia Polyglotta*, Dettelbach, pp. 1–6.
——, 2000c: 'La Semántica en el Diccionario Griego-Español', in *Cien años de investigación semántica: de Michel Bréal a la actualidad*, La Laguna, pp. 99–110.
——, 2000d: 'Towards a Syntax of Proto-Indo-European', *IF* 105, pp. 60–67.
——, 2000e: 'Griego y Latín, vivos en la lengua culta internacional', *Revista de Lengua y Literatura Españolas* 1, pp. 9–22.
——, 2000f: "Topónimos griegos en Iberia y Tartessos", *Emerita* 68, 2000, 1–18.
——, 2001: *Modelos griegos de la prosa castellana y Europea.* Madrid, Real Academia Española.
——, 2001a: 'Lexicographical Studies and Publications in Madrid', in *Praktiká, Tomos A*, Athens, pp. 1–14.
——, 2001b: 'Introducción a "El verbo Esslavo"', in *Paleobulgaristika i Starobulgaristica*, Veliko Turnovo, pp. 147–157.
——, 2001c: 'The reconstruction of the most ancient Indo-European at the School of Madrid', in *Cinquant' anni di ricerche linguistiche*, Milan 2001, pp. 89–95.
——, 2001d: "Más sobre Iberia y los topónimos griegos", *Archivo Español de Arqueología*, 25–33.
——, 2001e: "La composición de los poemas hesiódicos", *Emerita* 69, 197–224.
——, 2002a: "Sobre Botorrita IV", *Emerita* 70, 2002, pp. 1–8.
——, 2002b: "Los eslavos: de los orígenes a la helenización y la integración en Europa", en *España y el Mundo Eslavo*, Madrid 2002, pp. 27–40.
——, 2002c: "Hacia una teoría de la Ciencia Toponímica", *RSEL* 32, 2002, pp. 33–51.
——, 2002c: "La Lingüística griega en España (1983–2000)", en *Actas del II Congreso de la RSEL*, Madrid 2002, I, pp. 215–231.
——, 2002d: 'Tipología de las lenguas indoeuropeas modernas', *Studia Indoeuropaean*, pp. 9–29.
——, 2002e: "El léxico español y el diccionario de la Academia", in *2002. Central Nuclear Trillo 1. Encuentros Culturales*, pp. 103–122.
——, 2002f (en colaboración): *Diccionario Griego-Español VI.* Madrid, C.S.I.C.
——, 2003 (new ed.): *Tucidides. Historia de la guerra del Peloponeso*, Madrid.
——, 2003a: "Grecia en los orígenes de la prosa castellana", en *Grecia y España. Los confines de Europa.* Madrid 2002 (2003), pp. 13–23.
—— and Rodríguez Somolinos, J., 2003b: *Diccionario Griego-Español, vol. VI*, in *Illinois Classical Studies* 27–28, pp. 115–130.
——, 2004a: "Griego y Latín, ¿lenguas muertas?", *Estudios Clásicos*, 125, 2004, pp. 7–16.
Agud, A., 1980: *Historia y teoría de los casos.* Madrid, Gredos.
Agud, A. and others (eds.), *Las lenguas de corpus y sus problemas lingüísticos*, Madrid, 1996.
Akurgal, E., 1985: *Ancient civilizations and ruins of Turkey*, Istambul.
Albini, U. y Maltese, E. V., 1984: *Bizanzio nella sua Letteratura*, Milan.
Allen, W. S., 1987: 'The Development of the Attic Vowel System. Conspiracy or catastrophe?', *Minos* 20–22, pp. 21–32.
Alonso Troncoso, V., 1994: *El comercio griego arcaico*, La Coruña.
Altheim, F. and Stiehl, R. (eds.), 1971: *Christentum am Roten Meer*, Berlin and New York.
Aly, W., 1987 (1st ed. 1929): *Formprobleme der älteren griechischen Prosa*, New York.
Amadasi Guzzo, M. G., 1991: 'The shadow Line. Réflexions sur l'introduction de l'alphabet en Grèce', in Baurain, Cl., and others (eds.) 1991, pp. 293–309.
Ambrosini, R., 1970: 'Problemi e ipotesi sulla lengua dei graffiti di Segesta', in *Rendiconti, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, 25, pp. 461–464.

——, 1979: 'Le iscrizioni sicane, sicue, elime', in *Le iscrizioni pre-latine en Italia*, Rome, pp. 57–104.
——, 1983: 'Lengue nella Italia pregreca', in *Tre Millenni di Storia Linguistica*, Pisa, pp. 13–35.
Anagnostopulos, C., 1923: 'The language of Aristophanes', *Athena* 36, pp. 1–60.
André, J., 1971: *Emprunts et suffixes nominaux en latin*, Génève-Paris.
Apostolopoulos, Ph., 1984: *La langue du roman byzantin 'Callimaque et Chrysorrhoé'*, Athens.
Arnim, M., 1912: *De Philonis Byzantii genere dicendi*, Gryphia.
Aura Jorro, F., 1986–1996: *Diccionario Micénico, 1–11*, Madrid.
Babiniotis, G. A., 1972: *Τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς*, Athens.
——, 1978: *Νεοελληνική κοινή. Πέρα τῆς καθαρευμούσης καὶ τῆς δημοτικῆς*, Athens.
——, 1985: *Συνοπτικὴ ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης*, Athens.
——, 1999: *Η Γλωσσα ως αξια*. Athens, Gutenberg, 1999.
Bach, A., 1949: *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, Heidelberg.
Bádenas, P., 1984: *La estructura del diálogo platónico*, Madrid.
——, 1985a: 'La lengua griega en la baja Edad Media', *Erytheia* 6, pp. 5–41.
——, 1985b: 'Primeros textos altomedievales en griego vulgar', *Erytheia* 6, pp. 163–183.
Barrio, M. L. del, 1987: *El dialecto de Eubea*, Madrid.
——, 1988: 'La posición dialectal del euboico', *Emerita* 56, pp. 255–270.
——, 1994: 'Relación dialectal entre colonia y metrópoli: ¿herencia o proximidad geográfica? Eretria y Oropo', *RSEL* 24, pp. 315–328.
Barrios, M. J., 1996: *El dialecto cretense*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Seville.
Bartoněk, A., 1972: *Classification of the West Greek Dialects*, Brno.
——, 1979: 'Greek Dialects in the second millenium B.C.', *Eirene* 9, pp. 49–66.
——, 1987: 'The Greek Dialects between 1000 and 300 B.C.', *SMEA* 26, pp. 7–20.
——, 1991: 'L'evoluzione dei dialetti greci nella dimensions geografica delle età oscure', in Musti, D. and others (eds.) 1991, pp. 241–250.
——, 1996: 'The Mycenaean Language and Dialect', in De Miro, E. and others (eds.) 1996, pp. 7–23.
——, 2003: *Handbuch der Mykenischen*, Heidelberg, Winter.
Baugh, A. C. 1971 (2nd ed.): *A History of the English Language*, London.
Baumhauer, O. A., 1986: *Die sophistische Rhetorik. Eine Theorie sprachlicher Kommunikation*, Stuttgart.
Baurain, C., 1991: 'L'écriture syllabique à Chipre', in Baurain, C. and others (eds.), *Phoenikeia Grammata. Lire et écrire en Méditerranée. Actes du Colloque de Liège, 15–18 novembre 1989*, Namur, pp. 389–424.
Bechtel, F., 1921–1924 (2nd ed. 1963): *Die griechischen Dialekte*, I–III, Berlin.
Beck, H.-G., 1971: *Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur*, Munich.
Beck, I., 1971: *Die Ringskomposition bei Herodot und ihre Bedeutung für die Beweistechnik*, Hildesheim.
Bergua Cavero, Jorge, 2002: *Introducción al estudio de los hellenismus del español*, Zaragoza.
Bernabé, A., 1977: 'La vocalización de las sonantes indoeuropeas en griego', *Emerita* 45, pp. 269–298.
——, 1979: 'Los filósofos presocráticos como autores literarios', *Emerita* 47, pp. 357–394.
——, 1996 (2nd ed.): *Poetae Epici Graeci. Testimonia et Fragmenta*, pars I, Stuttgart and Leipzig.
——, 2004: *Poetae Epici Graecii. Testimonia et Fragmenta*, pars II, fasc. 1, München & Leipzig.
Bernand, E. and others, 1991: *Recueil des Inscriptions de l'Éthiopie pré-axoumite et axoumite*, Paris.
Bers, V., *Greek Poetic Syntax in the Classical Age*, New Haven.
Berschen, W., 1969–70: 'Literatur und Sprache. III. Literatur. Griechisches im lateinischen Mittelalter', in *Reallexikon* der *Byzantinistik* 3–4, cols. 227–304.
Beyer, K., 1961: *Semitische Syntax im neuen Testament*, Göttingen.

Bile, M., 1988: *Le dialecte crétois ancien*, Paris.
——, 1990a: 'Dialectologie et chronologies', *Lalies* 9, pp. 7–16.
——, 1990b: 'L'apport de la linguistique à la dialectologie', *Lalies* 9, pp. 17–39.
——, 1996: 'Une koina est-égéenne?', in Brixhe, C. (ed.) 1996a, pp. 133–146.
Brixhe, C. and Hodot, R., 1984: 'Les dialectes grecs, ces inconnus', *BSL* 79, pp. 155–203.
Birwé, 1956: *Griechisch-Arische Sprachbeziehungen im Verbalsystem*, Waldorf.
Biville F. 1987: *Graphie et pronontiation des mots grecs et latin*, Louvain.
——, 1990–1995: *Les emprunts du Latin au Grec. Approche Phonétique*, 1–11, Louvain-Paris.
——, 1993: 'Grec des romains ou latin des grecs? Ambigüité de quelques processus néologiques dans la koiné', in Brixhe, C. (ed.) 1993a, pp. 129–140.
Björk, G., 1950: *Das alpha impurum und die tragische Kunstsprache*, Uppsala.
Blanken, C. H., 1951: *Les grecs de Cargèse*, Leiden.
Blass F. and Debrunner A., 1949 (8th ed.): *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Göttingen.
Blümel, W., 1982: *Die aiolischen Dialekte*, Göttingen.
——, 1993: 'Dialekte und Dialektmischung im südwestlichen Kleinasien', in Crespo, E. and others (eds.) 1993, pp. 29–35.
Boardman, J., 1973: *Los griegos en Ultramar: comercio y expansión colonial antes de la era clásica*, Madrid.
Böhling, A., 1960: 'Griechische Elemente im Koptischen als Zeugniss für die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache', in *Akten des XI. internationalen Byzantinistenkongresses*, Munich.
Bondesson, B., 1936: *De sonis et formis titulorum Milesiorum Didymaeorumque*, Lund.
Boned Colera, P. and Rodríguez Somolinos, J., 1998: *Repertorio bibliográfico de la Lexicografía griega*, Madrid.
Bonfante, G., 1984: *Il miceneo, il greco storico e Omero*, Rome.
—— and L., 1985: *Lengua e cultura degli etruschi*, Rome.
Bonner, R. J., 1929–30: 'The conflict of Languages in the Roman World', *CJ* 25, pp. 579–92.
Bosch-Gimpera, P., 1960: *El problema indoeuropeo*, Mexico.
Bosque, I. and Pérez Fernández, M., 1987: *Diccionario inverso de la lengua española*, Madrid.
Bourguet, E., 1927: *Le dialecte laconien*, Paris.
Bowie, A. M., 1981: *The poetic Dialect of Sappho and Alcaeus*, New York.
Bowra, C. M., 1952: *Heroic Poetry*, London.
Braun, T. F. R. G., 1882: 'The Greeks and the Near East' and 'The Greeks in Egypt', in the reedition of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, III 3, pp. 1–31 y 32–56.
Bravo García, A., Signes Codoñer, J., Rubio Gómez, E., 1997: *El Imperio Bizantino*, Madrid.
Breitenbach, W., 1934: *Untersuchungen über die Sprache der Euripideischen Lyrik*, Stuttgart.
Bremer, J. M. and others, 1987: *Homer: Beyond oral Poetry*, Amsterdam.
Brescia, C., 1955: *Ricerche sulla lingua e lo stilo di Epicuro*, Naples.
Brillante, C., 1986: 'Sul dialetto miceneo e la lengua epica', *QUCC* 22, pp. 145–151.
——, 1987.: 'Sulla lingua della lirica corale', *QUCC* 23, pp. 145–153.
——, Cantilena, M., Pavese, C. O. (eds.), 1981: *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale*, Padua.
Briquel, D., 1991: 'L'écriture étrusque. D'après les inscriptions du VII[e] s. av. J.-Ch.', in Baurain, C. and others (eds.) 1991, pp. 615–63 1.
Brixhe, C., 1983: 'Épigraphie et grammaire du phrygien: état présent et perspectives', in Vineis, E. (ed.), *Le lingue indoeuropee di frammentaria attestazione*, Pisa, pp. 109–133.
——, 1984: *Essai sur le grec anatolien au début de notre ère*, Nancy.

——, 1990a: 'L'apparentement des dialectes grecs', *Lalies* 9, pp. 27–39.
——, 1990b: 'Dialectologie et idéologie', *Lalies* 9, pp. 41–53.
——, 1991a: *Sur la Crète antique. Histoire, Écriture, Langues*, Nancy.
——, 1991b: 'De la phonologie à l'écriture. Quelques aspects de l'adaptation de l'alphabet canéen au grec', in Baurain, C. and others (eds.) 1991, pp. 313–356.
——, 1991c: 'Du mycénien aux dialectes du ler millénaire. Quelques aspects de la problématique', in Musti, D. and others (eds.) 1991, pp. 251–272.
——, 1992: 'Du "datif" mycénien aux protagonistes de la situation linguistique', in Olivier, J. P. (ed.) 1992, pp. 129–157.
—— (ed.), 1993a and 1996a: *La koiné grecque antique*, I–II. Nancy.
——, 1993b: 'A chacun sa koiné?', in Brixhe, C. (ed.) 1993a, pp. 7–21.
——, 1993c: 'Le Grec en Carie et Lycie au IV[e] siècle', in Brixhe, C. (ed.) 1993a, pp. 59–82.
——, 1996b: 'Le II[e] et le I[er] siècles de l'histoire linguistique de la Laconie et la notion de koina', in Brixhe, C. (ed.) 1996a, pp. 93–111.
——, 1996c: *Phonétique et Phonologie du Grec ancien*, 1, Louvain-la-Nueve.
—— and Panayotis, A., 1988: 'L'hellénisation de la Macédonie, l'une des sources de la koiné', *Verbum* 11, pp. 245–260.
Browning, R., 1982: 'Greek diglossia yesterday and today', *Int. Journal of Sociology of Language* 35, pp. 49–68.
——, 1983 (2nd ed.): Greek transl. Athens 1996. *Medieval and Modern Greek*, Cambridge.
——, 1997: 'Von der Koine bis zu den Anfängen des modernen Griechisch', in H.-G. Nesserath (ed.), *Einleitung in die griechische Philologie*, Stuttgart and Leipzig, pp. 156–168.
Brunot, F., 1966: *Histoire de la langue française*, I–II vols., Paris.
Buchheit, V., 1960: *Untersuchungen zur theorie des Genos Epideiktikón von Gorgias bis Aristoteles*, Munich.
Buck, C. D. and Petersen, W., 1944: *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives*, Chicago.
Bubeník, V., 1989: *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a Sociolinguistic Area*, Amsterdam.
Burgmannn, L., 1991: 'Αέξεις ῥωμαϊκαὶ. Lateinische Wörter in Byzantinischen juristischen Texten', in W. Hörandner and E. Trapp (eds.) 1991, pp. 61–79.
Cadell, H., 1981: "Papyrologie et information lexicologique", en *Scritti Motevecchi*, Bolonia, pp. 73–83.
Cameron, A., 1931: 'Latin Words in the Greek Inscriptions of Asia Minor', *AJPh* 52, pp. 232–262.
Campanile, E., 1990a: *La riconstruzzione della cultura indoeuropea*, Pisa.
——, 1990b: 'Antigüedades indoeuropeas', in A. Giacalone – P. Ramat (eds.), *Las lenguas indoeuropeas*, Madrid, pp. 27–56.
Cantilena, M., 1982: *Ricerche sulla dizione epica. I. Per uno studio della formularietà degli Inni Omerici*, Rome.
Caratzas, S., 1957–58: 'Die Entstchung der neugriechischen Literatursprache', *Glotta* 36, pp. 194–208.
——, 1958: *L'origine des dialectes néo-grecs de l'Italie méridionale*, Paris.
——, 1976: *Les Tzacones*, Berlin.
Carpenter, Rh., 1968: 'Das Alter des griechischen Alphabets', in G. Pfohl (ed.) 1968a, pp. 1–39.
Casevitz, M., 1985: *Le vocabulaire de la colonisation en Grec ancien*, Paris.
Cassio, A. C., 1996: 'La prose ionienne postclassique et la culture de I'Asie Mineure à l'époque hellénistique', in Brixhe, C. (ed.) 1996a, pp. 147–170.
Castillo Didier, M., 1994: *Epopeya de Diyenís Akritas*, Santiago de Chile.
Cavenaile, R., 1951: 'Influence latine sur la vocabulaire grec de l'Égypte', *Chronique d'Égypte* 51, pp. 391–404.
Caveney, J., 1978: *Verbal Variation and Antithesis in the Narrative of Thucydides*, Ann Arbor.

Cervenka-Ehrenstrasser, I. M. and Diethart, J., 1996: *Lexikon der lateinischen Lehwörter in den griechischen Texten Aegyptens*, 1, Vienna.
Chadwick, H. M., 1967 (1st ed. 1912): *The Heroic Age*, Cambridge.
—— and Chadwick, N. K., 1968 (1st ed. 1936): *The Growth of literature*, Cambridge.
Chadwick, J., 1956: 'The Greek Dialects and Greek History', *Greece and Rome* 3, pp. 38–50.
——, 1958: *El enigma micénico*, Madrid.
——, 1964: 'Mycenaean elements in the Homeric Dialect', in G. S. Kirk (ed.), *The Language and Background of Homer*, Cambridge, pp. 38–50.
——, 1973: 'Who were the Dorians?', *PP* 103, pp. 103–117.
——, 1976: *The Mycenaean World*, Cambridge.
——, 1985: 'I dori e la creazione dei dialetti greci', in D. Musti (ed.) 1985a, pp. 3–12.
——, 1988: 'Differences and similarities between Cypriot and the other Greek Dialects', in *The History* (Karageorghis, J. and Masson, O., eds.), 1988, pp. 55–66.
——, 1990: 'The Descent of the Greek Epic', *JHS* 110, pp. 174–177.
Chantraine, P., 1927: *Histoire du Parfait Grec*, Paris.
——, 1933: *La formation des noms en grec ancien*, Paris.
——, 1942: *Grammaire Homérique (Phonétique et Morphologie)*, Paris.
——, 1956: *Études sur le vocabulaire grec*, Paris.
Christidis, A. Ph. (ed.), 2001: Ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσας, I., Thessaloniki.
Clarysse, W., 1987: *Greek loan Words in demotic*, Louvain.
Conejero, V., 1973: *El lenguaje coloquial griego*, Barcelona.
Consani, C., 1989: 'Storia e preistoria dei dialetti antichi: a proposito di una recente pubblicazione', *QUCC* 62, pp. 157–167.
——, 1993: 'La koiné et les dialectes grecs dans la documentation linguistique et la réflexion métalinguistique des prémiers siècles de notre ère', in Brixhe, C. (ed.) 1993a, pp. 23–39.
——, 1996: 'Koina et koiné dans la documentation épigraphique de l'Italie méridionale' in Brixhe, C. (ed.) 1996a, pp. 113–132.
Cook, J. M., 1982: 'The Eastern Greeks', in reedition of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, III 3, p. 196 ff.
Corsani, B., 1994: *Guida allo studio del Nuovo Testamento*, Rome.
Cortelazzo, M., 1970: *L'influsso linguistico greco a Venezia*, Bologna.
Cortés Gabaudán, F., 1986: *Fórmulas retóricas de la oratoria judicial ática*, Salamanca.
Coseriu, E., 1966: 'Structure lexicale et enseignement du vocabulaire', in *Actes du Premier Colloque International de Linguistique Appliquée*, Nancy, pp. 175–272.
——, 1977: 'Influencia griega sobre el latin vulgar', in *Estudios de Lingüística románica*, pp. 264–280.
Costas, P. S., 1979: *An Outline of the History of the Greek Language with particular Emphasis on the Koine and the subsequent Periods*, Chicago.
Crespo, E. and others, 1992: *Homerica. Estudios lingüísticos*, Madrid.
——, (eds.), 1993: *Dialectologica Graeca. Actas del II Coloquio Internacional de Dialectología Griega* (Miraflores de la Sierra [Madrid], 19–21 de junio de 1991), Madrid.
Crespo, E., Conti, L., Maquieira, H., 2003: *Sintaxis del Griego Clásico*. Madrid, Gredos.
Crossland, R. A., 1985: 'La tradizione greca sulla migrazione dorica', in Musti, D. (ed.) 1985a, pp. 235–240.
Cruz, A. de la y Cañete, A., 1992: *Historia del inglés*. Málaga.
Cruz, J. de la and Trainor, P., 1989: *Gramática inglesa*, Madrid.
Cunchillos, J. L. and Zamora, J. A., 1995: *Gramática Ugarítica*, Madrid.
Curtis, A., 1985: *Ugarit (Ras Shamra)*, Cambridge.
Dagron, G., 1969: 'Aux origines de la civilisation Byzantine: langue de culture et langue d'État', *Revue Historique* 241, pp. 23–56.
Daris, S., 1991 (2nd ed.): *Il lessico latino nel greco d'Egitto*, Barcelona.

Daskalakis, B., 1960: *Ὁ Ἑλληνισμός τῆς ἀρχαίας Μακεδονίας*, Athens.
Davaras, C., 1976: *Guide to Cretan Antiquities*, Park Ridge, New Jersey.
Dawkins, R., 1916: *Modern Greek in Asia Minor: a Study of Dialect of Silly, Cappadocia and Pharasa*, Cambridge.
——, 1940: 'The Dialects of Modern Greek', *TPHs* pp. 1–38.
Debrunner, A., 1933: *Nahklassisches Griechisch*, Berlin.
——, and Scherer, A., 1969 (II, 2nd ed. by A. Scherer): *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*, Berlin.
Deger-Jalkotzy. S. (ed.) 1983: *Griechenland, die Aegäis und die Levante während der Dark Ages vom 12. bis zum 9. Jh. v. Chr.*, Vienna.
Deichgräber, K., 1962: 'Rhythmische Elemente im Logos des Heraklit', *AWLM, Abh. des Geistes und Sprachwiss. Klasse*, pp. 477–552.
Deissmann, A., 1923 (4th ed.): *Licht von Osten*, Tübingen.
Delatte, L. and others, 1981: *Dictionnaire fréquentiel et inverse de la langue latine*, Liège.
Denniston, J., 1970 (1st ed. 1952): *Greek Prosa Style*, Oxford.
Descoeudres, P. G. (ed.), 1990: *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*, Canberra and Oxford.
De Miro, E. and others (eds.), 1996: *Atti e Memorie del secondo Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia*, Rome.
Des Places, É., 1934: 'Style parlé et style oral chez les écrivains grecs', *Mel. Bidez*, I, 267–286.
Despotopoulos, C., 1985–86: 'Hippocrate et la philosophie', *Philosophia* 15–16, pp. 145–155.
Devoto, G., 1962, *Origini indo-europee*, Florence, 1962,
——, 1968 (trans.): *Geschichte der Sprache Roms*, Heidelberg.
Di Vido, St., 1997: *Gli elimi. Storie di contatti e di rappresentazione*, Pisa.
Díaz Rolando, E., 1989: *La Alexíada*, Seville.
Díaz Tejera, A., 1961: 'Ensayo de un método lingüístico para la cronología de Platón', *Emerita* 29, pp. 241–286.
Dickinson, O., 1977: *The Origins of mycenaean Civilization*, Göteborg.
——, 1995: *The Aegean Bronze Age*, Cambridge.
Diehl, E., 1950: *Anthologia Lyrica* I 1–2, Leipzig.
Dieterich, K., 1898: *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache von der hellenistischen Zeit bis zum 10. Jahrhundert nach Christ*, Leipzig.
Dietrich, M. and Lorentz, O., 1991: 'Die Keilalphabete aus Ugarit', in Baurain, C. and others (eds.) 1991, pp. 49–67.
Dietrich, W., 1995: *Griechisch und Romanisch.* Divergenzen *und Parallelen*, Münster.
Dimitrakos, D. B., 1933–51: *Μέγα Λεξικὸν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης*, Athens, 9 vols.
Doudna, J. Ch., 1961: *The Greek of the Gospel of Mark*, Philadelphia.
Dressler, W., 1963: *Einfluss epichorischen Sprachen auf die griechischen Inschriften Kleinasiens*, Vienna.
——, 1965: 'Der Untergang des Dativs in der Anatolischen Gräzität', *WS* 78, pp. 83–107.
Drews R., 1989: *The coming of the Greeks*, Princeton.
Dubois, L., 1983: *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien*, Paris.
Duhoux, Y., 1977: *Le disque de Phaestos. Archéologie, Épigraphie, Édition Critique*, Louvain.
——, 1982: *L'éteocrétois. Les textes. La langue*, Amsterdam.
——, 1983: *Introduction aux dialectes grecs anciens*, Louvain-la-Neuve.
——, 1987: 'Linéaire B crétois et continental: Éléments de comparaison', in Ilievski, P. H. and Crepajac, I. (eds.) 1987.
——, 1988: 'Les éléments grecs non doriens du crétois et la situation dialectale grecque au II[e] millénaire', *Cretan Studies*, 1, pp. 57–72.
——, 2000: *Le verbe grec ancien.* Louvain la Neuve.
Durán, A., 1966: *La lengua de Gorgias.* Unpublished bachelor thesis, Madrid.

Durante, M., 1966: *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca*, Rome.
——, 1968: 'Vicende linguistiche della Grecia fra l'età micenea e il medioevo ellenico', in *Atti del 1° Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia. Roma 27 settembre–3 ottobre 1967*, Rome, vol. II, pp. 744–755.
Durham, D. B., 1969 (1st ed. 1913): *The Vocabulary of Menander*, Amsterdam.
Dvornik, F., 1956: *The Slavs. Their Early History and Civilization*, Boston.
Earp, F. R., 1972 (1st ed. 1944): *The Style of Sophocles*, Cambridge.
——, 1970 (1st ed. 1948): *The Style of Aeschylus*, New York.
Edwards, G. P., 1971: *The Language of Hesiod in its traditional Context*, Oxford.
Egea, J. M., 1987a: 'El griego de los textos medievales', *Veleia* 4, pp. 255–284.
——, 1987b: 'La lengua de la ciudad en el s. xii', *Erytheia* 8, pp. 241–262.
——, 1988: *Gramática de la Crónica de Morea*, Vitoria.
——, 1990: *Documenta selecta ad historiam lenguae Graecae inlustrandam II (medioaevi)*, Vitoria.
——, 1990–91: 'La lengua de la historiografía bizantina tras el cambio lingüístico', *Erytheia*, 11–12, pp. 21–32.
Eissfeldt, O., 1968: 'Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung unseres Alphabets', in G. Pfohl (ed.) 1968a, pp. 214–220.
Ek, S., 1942: *Herodotismen in der Archäologie des Dionysius von Halicarnassus*, Lund.
——, 1946: *Herodotismen in der jüdischen Archäologie des Josephus*, Lund.
Eklund, B.-L., 1976: *Modern Greek. Verbal Aspect and Compound Nouns. Two Studies*, Gothenburg.
Elefteriadis, O., 1985: *Modern Greek. A contemporary Grammar*, Palo Alto, California.
Ernout, A., 1954: *Aspects du vocabulaire latin*, Paris.
Eseverri, C., 1945: *Diccionario Etimológico de Helenismos Españoles*, Burgos.
Ewert, A., s. a.: *The French Language*, London.
Fabrini, P. and Lanni, A., 1979: 'Il problema della lengua nello scritto ippocratico De arte', *RSF* 34, pp. 123–133.
Falkner, M., 1968: 'Zur Frühgeschichte des griechischen Alphabets', in G. Pfohl (ed.) 1968a, pp. 143–171.
Favre, Ch., 1914, *Thesaurus verborum quae in titulis ionicis leguntur cum Herodoteo sermone comparatus*, Lund.
Fernández, Francisco, 1982: *Historia de la lengua inglesa*, Madrid.
Fernández Álvarez, P., 1981: *El argólico occidental*, Salamanca.
Fernández de Palencia, Alfonso, 1490: *Universal Vocabulario*, Seville.
Fernández Delgado, J. A., 1983: 'Los estudios de poesía oral cincuenta años después de su "descubrimiento"', *Anuario de Estudios Filológicos* 6, pp. 63–90.
——, 1985: *Los oráculos y Hesíodo. Poesía oral mántica y gnómica griegas*, Cáceres.
Fernández Marcos, N., 1973: *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea*, Madrid.
——, 1979: *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia*, Madrid.
Fernández Nieto, F. G., 1983: 'La colonización griega' and 'Los griegos en España', in *Historia de España Antigua*, Madrid, pp. 527–558 and 559–591.
——, 1992: 'Griegos y colonización griega en la peninsula ibérica', in Chaves Tristán, F. (ed.), *Griegos en Occidente*, Seville, pp. 129–145.
Fernández-Galiano, M., 1966: 'Helenismos', in *Enciclopedia Lingüística Hispánica* II, pp. 51–77. Madrid.
——, 1969: *La transcripción castellana de los nombres propios griegos*, Madrid.
——, 1984: 'El marco histórico de la epopeya', in R. Adrados-Fernández-Galiano, Gil and Lasso de la Vega, *Introducción a Homero*, pp. 197–234, 2nd ed., Barcelona.
Ferrari, F., 1997: *Romanzo di Esopo*. Introduzione e testo critico, Milano.
Finnegan, R., 1977: *Oral Poetry*, Cambridge.
Fleischer, U., 1939: *Untersuchungen zu den pseudohippokratischen Schriften*, Berlin.
Forssmann, B., 1968: *Untersuchungen zur Sprache Pindars*, Wiesbaden.
——, 1991: 'Schichten der Homerischen Sprache', in Latacz, J. (ed.), *Zweihundert Jahre Homerforschung*, Stuttgart-Leipzig, pp. 259–288.
Foucault, J. A., 1972: *Recherches sur la langue et le style de Polybe*, Paris.

Foumet, J. L., 1989: 'Les emprunts du grec à l'égyptien', *BSL* 84, pp. 55–80.
Fränkel, E., 1910–12: *Geschichle der griechischen Nomina Agentis auf -τήρ, -τώρ, -της (-τ-)*, Strasbourg.
Frösén, J., 1974: *Prolegomena to a Study of the Greek Language in the first Centuries A.D.*, Helsinki.
Funk, R. W., 1977 (2nd ed.): *A beginning-intermediate Grammar of the Hellenistic Greek*, Missoula, Montana.
Gallay, P., 1933: *Langue et stylè de Saint Grégoire de Nacianze dans sa correspondance*, Paris.
Gamkrelidze, Th. – V. Ivanov, V. V., 1995: *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans*, Berlin-New York.
Gangutia, E., 1994: *Cantos de mujeres en Grecia*, Madrid.
Garbrach, K. A., 1978: *A Grammar to the Ionic Inscriptions from Erythraea*, Meisenheim.
García Blanco, J., 1988: *Gramática de las inscripciones eleas*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Madrid.
García Domingo, E., 1979: *Latinismos en la koiné (en los documentos epigráficos desde el 212 a. J. C hasta el 14 d J. C.)*, Salamanca.
García del Pozo, R., 1983: *Las inscripciones del locrio occidental*, Madrid.
García Teijeiro, M., 1984: 'Reflexiones sobre la clasificación dialectal del panfilio', in *Athlon. Satura grammatica in honorem Francisci R. Adrados*, I, Madrid, pp. 191–197.
——, 1988: 'Retórica, oratoria y magia', in G. Morocho (ed.), *Estudios de drama y retórica en Grecia y Roma*, León, pp. 143–153.
——, 1996: 'Sobre la lengua de los documentos mágicos griegos', in A. Agud and others (eds.), *Las lenguas de* corpus *y sus problemas lingüísticos*, Salamanca.
García-Ramón, J. L., 1975: *Les origines postmycénnienes du groupe dialectal éolien*, 1975.
——, 1987: 'Geografía intradialectal tesalia: la fonética, *Verbum* 10, pp. 101–153.
——, 1999: 'Griechische Dialekte', in Cancik (ed.), *Der Neue Pauly*.
Gautier, L., 1911: *La langue de Xénophon*, Geneva.
Gentili, B., 1969: 'Epigramma ed elegia', in AA.VV. 1969, pp. 37–81.
—— and Prato, C., 1979–85: *Poetae Elegiaci*, Stuttgart-Leipzig, 2 vols.
Georgakas, D. and Κέντρον 'Ελληνικῆς γλώσσης, 1998: *Λεξικό τῆς Νέας 'Ελληνικῆς γλώσσας*. Vol. 1, Salonika.
Georgiev, V., 1941: *Vorgriechische Sprachwissenschaft*, Sofia.
——, 1964: 'Mycenaean among the other Greek Dialects', *Wingspread Colloquium*, pp. 125–129.
——, 1981: *Introduction to the History of the Indo-European Languages*, Sofia.
Gerov, B., 1980: 'Die lateinisch-griechische Sprachgrenze auf der Balkanhalbinsel', in Neumann, G. and Untermann, J. (eds.) 1980, Bonn.
Giacalone, A. – Ramat, P. (eds.), 1993: *Las linguas indoeuropeas*, Madrid, Cátedra.
Giannotta, M. E. and others (eds.), 1994: *La decifrazione del cario*, Rome.
Gignac, F. T., 1976: *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods. Vol. 1. Phonology*, Milan.
——, 1981: *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Vol. II *Morphology*, Milan.
Gimbutas, M., 1974: *The Gods and Goddeses of Old Europe*, London.
——, 1989: *The Language of the Goddess*, San Francisco.
Giundin, L. A., 1987: 'A propos du statut de la langue des macédoniens de l'Antiquité', *EBalk* 23, pp. 19–27.
Goldsmith, V., 1963 (2nd ed.), *Les dialogues de Platon. Structure et méthode dialectique*, Paris.
González Castro, J. F., 1994: *Palabras castellanas de origen griego*, Madrid.
Gostoli, A., 1990: *Terpandro. Introduzione, testimonianze, testo critico, traduzione e commento*, Rome.
Graham, A. J., 1982: 'The colonial expansion of Greece' and 'The Western Greeks', in the reedition of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, III 3, pp. 83 ff. and 183 ff.
Grandgent, D. A., 1928: *Introducción al latín vulgar*, Madrid.

Guarducci, M., 1967–78: *Epigrafia Greca*, I–IV, Rome.
——, 1968: 'Die Geburt des griechischen Alphabets', in G. Pfohl (ed.) 1968a, pp. 197–213.
——, 1987: *L'Epigrafia greca dalle origini al tardo impero*, Rome.
Haberle, J., 1938, *Untersuchungen über den ionischen Prosastil*, Munich.
Haarmann, H., 1996: 'Aspects of early Indo-European contacts with the neighboring cultures', *IF* 101, pp. 1–14.
Hainsworth, J. B., 1967: 'Greek Views of Greek Dialectology', *TPHS* 1967, pp. 62–76.
——, 1968: *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*, Oxford.
Hajnal, I., 1987 and 1988: 'Zur Sprache der ältesten kretischen Inschriften', *IF* 92, pp. 58–84 and 93, pp. 62–87.
——, 1995: *Studien zum Mykenischen Kasussystem*, Berlin and New York.
Hamm, E.-M., 1957: *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios*, Berlin.
Hammond, N. G. L., 1986 (3rd ed.): *A History of Greece*, Oxford.
Hansen, P. A., 1983: *Carmina Epigraphica saeculorum VIII–Va. Chr. n.*, Berlin-New York.
Hatzidakis, G. N. 1905–7: *Μεσαιωνικά καί Νέα Ἑλληνικά*, Athens, 2 vols.
——, 1947 (1st ed. 1915): *Σύντομος ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης*, Athens.
——, 1977 (1st ed. 1892): *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, Hildesheim (Greek transl., Athens 1976).
Häusler, A., 1985: 'De Anfänge von Rad und Wagen in der Kulturgeschichte Europas', in *Produktivkräfte und Produktionsverhältnisse*, Berlin, pp. 121–133.
——, 1992a: 'Zum Verhältnis von Ockergrabkultur und Schnurkeramik', in *Schnurkeramik Symposium*, Prague, pp. 541–548.
——, 1992b: 'Zur kulturgeschichtlichen Einordnung griechischer Stelen. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem Ursprung der Griechen', in *Heinrich Schliemann. Grundlagn und Ergebnisse. . . .* Berlin, pp. 253–266.
——, 1994: 'Archäologische Zeugnisse für Pferd und Wagen in Ost- und Mittel-Europa', in *Die Indogermanen und das Pferd*, Budapest, pp. 217–257.
——, 1995: 'Ueber Archäologie und Ursprung der Indogermanen', in *Whither Archaeologie?*, Prague, pp. 211–229.
Havelock, E. A., 1986: *La Musa impara a scrivere*, Bari.
——, 1996: *Alle origini della filosofia greca. Una revisione storica*, Bari.
Heisenberg, A., 1934: *Neugriechische dialekttexte*, Heidelberg.
Hernández González, F., 1997: 'Apuntes lexicales sobre Faventino', *Cien añol de investigación semántica*, II, pp. 1611–1625.
Hettrich, H., 1985: 'Zum Kasussynkretismus im Mykenischen', *MSS* 46, pp. 111–122.
Heubeck, A., 1961: *Praegraeca*, Erlangen.
——, 1972: 'Syllabic r in Mycenaean Greek?', *Acta Mycenaea* II, pp, 55–79, Salamanca.
——, 1981: 'Zum Problem der homerischen Kunstsprache', *MH* 38, pp. 65–80.
Hiersche, R., 1970: *Grundzüge der griechischen Sprachgeschichte*, Wiesbaden.
——, 1972: *Die Sprache Homers im Lichte neuerer Forschungen*, Innsbruck.
Hilhorst, A., 1976: *Sémitismes et latinismes dans le Pasteur d'Hermas*, Nijmegen.
Hill, D., 1967: *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings*, Cambridge.
Hodot, R., 1990a: *Le dialecte éolien d'Asie*, Paris.
——, 1990b: 'Dialecte et koiné', *Lalies* 9, pp. 55–62.
——, 1990c: 'Inscriptions et littérature dialectales', *Lalies* 9, pp. 63–70.
Hoekstra, A., 1957: 'Hésiode et la tradition orale', *Mnemosyne 10*, p. 193 ff.
——, 1969a: *Homeric Modifications of formulaic prototypes*, Amsterdam.
——, 1969b: *The sub-epic stage of the formulaic tradition*, Amsterdam.
Hoffmann, O. and others, 1973: *Historia de la lengua griega*, Madrid.
Hofinger, M., 1981: *Études sur le vocabulaire grec archaïque*, Leiden.
Hooker, J. T., 1976: *Mycenaean Greece*, London.
——, 1977: *The Language and Text of the Lesbian Poets*, Innsbruck.

——, 1983: 'The Homeric Dialect', in *Concilium Eirene XVI*, III, pp. 75–79.
——, 1991: 'Mycenology in the 1980's', *Kratylos* 36, pp. 32–72.
Hörandner, W. and Trapp, E. (eds.), 199 *1: Lexicographica Byzantina. Beiträge zum Symposion zur byzantinischen Lexikographie (Wien, 1.–4.3.1989)*, Vienna.
Horrocks, G., 1987: 'The Ionic-Epic tradition: Was there an Aeolic Phase in its Development?', *Minos* 20–22, pp. 269–294.
——, 1997: *Greek. A History of the Language and its Speakers*, London and New York.
Householder, F. W., 1972: *Greek. A Survey of Recent Work*, The Hague-Paris.
—— and others, 1964: *Reference Grammar of Literary Dimotiki*, Bloomington.
Hoz, J. de, 1964: 'Poesía oral independiente de Homero en Hesíodo y los himnos homéricos', *Emerita* 32, pp. 283–298.
——, 1969: 'Acerca de la historia de la escritura prelatina en Hispania', *AEA* 119–120, pp. 104–117.
——, 1970: 'Un grafito griego de Toscanos y la exportación de aceite ateniense en el siglo VII', *Madrider Mitteilungen* 11, pp. 102–109.
——, 1979: 'On some Problems of Iberian Script and Phonetics', in *Actas del II Coloquio sobre lenguas y culturas prerromanas de la Peninsula Ibérica*, Salamanca, pp. 257–271.
——, 1987: 'La escritura greco-ibérica', *Studia Palaeohispanica*, pp. 285–298, Vitoria.
——, 1991: 'The Phoenician Origin of the early Hispanic Scripts', in Baurain, C. and others (eds.) 1991, pp. 669–682.
——, 1992: 'Arqueología del lenguaje sin lágrimas ... y sin lenguaje', *Arqritica* 3, pp. 11–14.
——, 1996: 'El origen de las escrituras paleohispánicas quince años después', in *Actas del VI Coloquio sobre lenguas y culturas prerromanas de la Peninsula Ibérica*, Salamanca, pp. 171–206.
Hualde Pascual, M. P., 1997: 'Eolismos en Jonia: revisión de un problema de geografía intradialectal', *Emerita* 65, pp. 221–256.
Hult, J., 1990: *Syntactic Variation in Greek of the 5th Century A.D.*, Goteborg.
Humbert, J., 1930: *La disparition du datif grec*, Paris.
——, 1972 (1st ed. 1945): *Syntaxe grecque*, Paris.
Hummel, P., 1993: *La Syntaxe de Pindare*, Louvain.
Hunger, H., 1978a: 'Stilstufen in der Byzantinischen Geschichtschreibung des 12. Jh. Anna Kommene und Michael Glykas', *Byz. Studies 5*, pp. 139–170.
——, 1978b: *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, Munich.
Hussey, J. M. (ed.), 1966: *The Cambridge Medieval History IV. Byzantium and Its Neighbours*, Cambridge.
Huxley, C., 1961: *Crete and the Luwians*, Oxford.
Ilievski, P. H. y Crepajac, I., 1987: *Tractata Mycenaea*, Skopje.
Impellizzeri, S., 1975: *La letteratura bizantina da Costantino a Fozio*, Florence-Milan.
Irigoin, J., 1980: 'La formation du vocabulaire de l'anatomie en grec: du mycénien aux principaux traités de la Collection Hippocratique', *Hippocratica. Actes du Colloque hippocratique de Paris (4–9 Sept. 1978)*, Paris, pp. 247–257.
——, 1983: 'Paralleles linguistiques a l'interprétation de termes techniques attestés dans la Collection Hippocratique', in Lasserre, F. y Mudry, P. (eds.), *Formes de pensée dans la Collection hippocratique. Actes du IVe Colloque International hippocratique (Lausanne, 23–26 septembre 1981)*, Geneva, pp. 173–180.
Iselin, I. B. S., 1991: 'The transfer of the Alphabet to the Greeks: the state of documentation', in Baurain, C. and others (eds.) 1991, pp. 283–291.
Isenring, H. C., *Die lateinischen Adjectiva auf -icus und -ticus*, Zurich 1955.
Janko, R., 1982: *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns*, Cambridge.
Jeffery, L. H., 1990 (2nd ed.), *The local scripts of archaic Greece*, Oxford.
Jellinek, M. H., 1926: *Geschichte der gotischen Sprache*, Berlin.
Kahane, H. y R., 1979: 'Les éléments byzantins dans les langues romanes', in *Graeca et Romanica, Scripta Selecta*, Amsterdam, pp. 67–73.

——, 1970 ff.: 'Abendland und Byzanz. III. Literatur und Sprache. B. Sprache', in *Reallexicon der Byzantinistik*, cols. 345–640.
Kaimio, J., 1979: *The Roman and the Greek Language*, Helsinki, 1979.
Kajanto, I., 1980: 'Minderheiten und ihre Sprachen in der Hauptstadt Rom', in G. Neumann and J. Untermann (eds.), 1980, pp. 83–101.
Kalleris, J. N., 1954: *Les anciens macédoniens. Étude historique et linguistique*, Athens.
Kapsomenakis, S. G., 1938: *Voruntersuchungen zu einer Grammatik der Papyri aus der nachchristlichen Zeit*, Munich.
Kapsomenos, S. G., 1958: 'Die griechische Sprache zwischen Koine und Neugriechisch', in *Berichte zum XI. Internationalen Byzantinistenkongress, II* 1, Munich.
Karageorghis, J. y Masson, O. (eds.), 1988: *The History of the Greek Language in Cyprus. Proceedings of an International Symposium sponsored by the Pierides Foundation. Larnaca, Cyprus, 8–13 September 1986*, Nicosia.
Karageorghis, V., 1991: *Les anciens Chipriotes. Entre Orient et Occident*, Paris.
Karoussos, Ch., 1973: *Rhodos*, Athens.
Katičic, R., 1976: *Ancient Languages of the Balkans*, The Hague, 2 vols.
Kaukalá, M. I., 1992: *Μνημόσυνο κρητικῆς διαλέκτου*, Athens.
Kazazis, K., 1974: 'The status of the Turkisms in the present-day Balkan languages', in Birnbaum, H. and Vryonis, S. (eds.), *Aspects of the Balkans*, The Hague, pp. 87–116.
Kieckers, E., 1910: 'Das Eindringen der Koine in Kreta', *IF* 27, pp. 72–118.
Kinstrand, J. F., 1975: *Bion of Borysthenes*, Uppsala.
Kirk, G. S. (ed.), 1964: *The Language and Background of Homer*, Cambridge.
——, 1976: *Homer and the Oral Tradition*, Cambridge.
Kock, B., 1910: *De epigrammatum Graecorum dialectis*, Göttingen.
Kontosopoulos, N. G., 1970: ''Η σημερινὴ γλωσσικὴ κατάστασις ἐν Κρήτῃ καί ἡ γλώσσα τῶν ἐν 'Αθήναις Κρητῶν', *Κρητικὴ Χρονικά* 22, pp. 144–278.
——, 1978: *L'influence du français sur le grec*, Athens.
——, 1980: ''Η γλώσσα συγχρόνου πεζοῦ κρητικοῦ κειμένου', in *Μνῆμα*. . . . Κουρμούλ, Athens, p. 19 ff.
——, 1988: Γλωσσικὸς ῎Ατλας τῆς Κρήτης, Iraklio.
——, 1994 (2nd ed.): *Διάλεκτοι και ιδιώματα της νέας Ελληνικῆς*, Athens.
Koutsoudas, A., 1962: *Verb Morphology of Modern Greek: A Descriptive Study*, Bloomington, Indiana.
Krafft, F., 1963: *Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu Homer und Hesiod*, Göttingen.
Kramer, J., 1983: 'Der kaiserzeitliche griechisch-lateinische Sprachbund', in *Ziele und Wege der Balkanlinguistik*, Berlin, pp. 115–131.
Krause, M., 'Inschriften aus Faras', in F. Altheim and R. Stiehl, *Christentum am Roten* Meer, Berlin-New York, 1971.
Krauss, S., 1898: *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum*, Berlin.
Kretschmer, P., 1894: *Die griechischen Vaseninschriften ihrer Sprache nach untersucht*, Gütersloh.
——, 1901: *Die Entstehung der koiné*, Vienna.
——, 1909: 'Zur Geschichte der griechischen Dialekte. I', *Glotta* 1, pp. 9–59.
——, 1946: *Introducción a la Lingüística griega y latina*, Madrid.
Kriarás, E., 1968 ff.: *Λεξικὸ τῆς Μεσαιωνικῆς ἑλληνικῆς δημώδους γραμματείας (1110–1669)*, Thessalomiki, vols. I–XIII.
Kroll, W., 1935: *La sintaxis cientifica en la enseñanza del latin*, Madrid.
Krumbacher, K., 1897 (2nd ed.): *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur*, Munich.
Kullmann, W. and Reichel, M. (eds.), 1990: *Der Uebergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen*, Tübingen.
Laguna, G., 1995: 'Influencia lingüística del griego sobre el latin', *Tempus* 9, pp. 5–32.

Lambert, P.-Y., 1994: *La langue gauloise*, Paris.
Lamberts, E., 1967: *Untersuchungen zur Parataxe bei Herodot*, Vienna.
Lampe, G. W. H., 1961: *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford.
Lanza, D., 1983: 'Quelques remarques sur le travail linguistique du médicin', in Lasserre, F. and Mudry, P. (eds.), *Formes de pensée dans la Collection hippocratique. Actes du IVe Colloque International hippocratique*, Geneva, pp. 181–185.
Lapesa, R., 1980 (8th ed.): *Historia de la lengua española*, Madrid.
Lara, D., 1984: *Estudio sobre la composición de los tratados hipocráticos*, Madrid.
——, 1997: *Iniciación a la lexicografía griega*, Madrid, 1997.
Latacz, J. (ed.), 1991: *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung*, Stuttgart.
Lazzeroni, R., 1969: 'Correnti linguistiche nel greco letterario', in *Studi e saggi linguistici*, suppl. a *L'Italia dialettale* 33, pp. 111–138.
Lee, J. A. L., 1983: *LAX. A lexical Study of the Septuagenta Version of the Pentateuch*, Chico, California.
Lehmann, W. P., 1986: *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*, Leiden.
——, 1992: *Die gegenwärtige Richtung der indogermanischen Forschung*, Budapest.
Lehrmann, A., 1996: 'Indo-Hittite revisited', *IF* 101, pp. 73–88.
Lejeune, M., 1968: 'Rapport sur le grec mycénien', *Atti del 1° Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia. Roma 27 settembre – 3 ottobre 1967*, Rome, vol. II, pp. 726–731.
——, 1976: 'Pre-mycénien et proto-mycenien', *BSL* 71, p. 193 ff.
——, 1993: 'D'Alcoy à Espanca: Réflexions sur les écritures paléo-hispaniques', in Michel Lejeune. *Notice biographique et bibliographique*, Louvain, pp. 53–86.
Leumann, M., 1948: 'Griechische Verba in -ίζειν im Latein', in *Mélanges Marouzeau*, Paris, pp. 371–389.
——, 1950: *Homerische Wörter*, Basilea.
——, 1968: 'Die Entgliederung entlehnter griechischer Verben ins Latein', *Studii Clasice* 10, pp. 7–12.
Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., Jones, H. S., 1940 (9th ed., there are two *Supplements* of 1968 and 1997): *Greek-English Dictionary*, Oxford.
Lilja, S., 1968: *On the Style of the Earliest Greek Prose*, Helsingfors.
Lillo, A., 1979: *El dialecto arcadio*, Salamanca.
Linde, P., 1906: *De Epicuri vocabulis ab optima Atthide alienis*, Bratislava.
Ljungvik, H., 1926: *Studien zur Sprache der Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten*, Uppsala.
——, 1932: *Beiträge zur Syntax der spätgriechieschen Volkssprache*, Uppsala.
Lloyd-Jones, H. y Parsons, P., 1983: *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, Berlin and New York.
Long, A., 1968: *Language and thought in Sophocles*, London.
López Eire, A., 1966: 'Dislocación sintáctica y ático coloquial en la comedia aristofánica', in Agud, A. and others (eds.), pp. 167–197.
——, 1972–1973: 'Los jonios y el jónico-ático', *Zephyrus* 23–24, pp. 197–207.
——, 1977: 'Nuevas perspectives metodológicas en dialectologia griega', *Helmantica* 28, pp. 315–329 (in López Eire 1986a, p. 289 ff.)
——. 1978a: 'El retorno de los Heraclidas', *Zephyrus* 28–29, pp. 287–297.
——, 1978b: 'Problemática actual de la Dialectología griega', in *Actas del V Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, Madrid, pp. 457–479.
——, 1984a: 'Genealogía del Atico', *EC* 26, pp. 43–46.
——, 1984b: 'En tomo a la lengua del *Corpus Hippocraticum*', *Emerita* 52, pp. 325–354.
——, 1984c: 'Tucidides y la koiné', in *Athlon. Satura grammatica in honorem Francisci R. Adrados, 1*, Madrid, II, pp. 245–261.
——, 1985: 'Jónico y Ático', in Melena, J. L. (ed.), *Symbolae Ludovico Mitxelena septuagenario oblatae*, I, Vitoria, pp. 81–93.
——, 1986a: *Estudios de Lingüística, Dialectología e Historia de la lengua griega*, Salamanca.
——, 1986b: 'La lengua de la comedia aristofánica', *Emerita* 54, pp. 237–274.
——, 1987a: 'Sobre los orígenes de la oratoria', *Minerva* 1, pp. 13–31.

——, 1987b: 'Géographie intradialectale de l'ionien-attique', *Verbum* 10, 155–178.
——, 1989a: 'Las invasiones griegas y la dialectología', *Homenaje a Marcelo Vigil*, Salamanca, pp. 147–169.
——, 1989b: 'Sobre las innovaciones del jónico-ático', in Borrego Nieto, J. and others (eds.), *Philologica I. Homenaje a D. Antonio Llorente*, Salamanca, pp. 191–1998.
——, 1991: *Atico, koiné y aticismo. Estudios sabre Aristófanes*, Murcia.
——, 1992: 'Algunos aspectos de la lengua de los tratados hipocráticos más antiguos', in *Actas del VIIe Congrès Hippocratique*, Madrid, pp. 351–364.
——, 1993a: 'De l'Attique á la koiné', in Brixhe, C. (ed.), 1993a, pp. 41–57.
——, 1993b: 'Estructuras lingüísticas recurrentes en las inscripciones dialectales griegas', in Crespo, E. and others (eds.) 1993, pp. 221–227.
——, 1994: 'Historia del ático a través de sus inscripciones', *Zephyrus* 47, pp. 157–188.
——, 1996a: *La lengua coloquial de la comedia aristofánica*, Murcia.
——, 1996b: 'L'influence de l'ionien-attique sur les autres dialectes épigraphiques et l'origine de la koiné', in Brixhe, C. (ed.) 1996a, pp. 7–42.
—— and Lillo, A., 1982: 'Panfilia y el dialecto panfilio', *Zephyrus* 34–35, pp. 243–248.
—— and Lillo, A., 1983: 'En torno a la clasificación dialectal del panfilio', *Emerita* 51, pp. 5–27.
—— and Méndez Dosuna, J., 1971: 'En busca de la situación dialectal del jónicoático', in *Simposio de Colonizaciones*, pp. 247–278, Barcelona.
—— and Méndez Dosuna, J., 1980: 'El problema de los dialectos dorios y nordoccidentales', *Emerita* 48, pp. 15–30 (in López Eire 1986a, p. 273 ff.)
López Férez, J. A., 1987: 'Problemas lingüísticos en los escritos hipocráticos: el tratado Sobre los Humores', *Emerita* 55, pp. 253–263.
Lord, A. B., 1960: *The Singer of Tales*, Cambridge (Mass.).
Louw, J. P., 1982: *Semantics of the New Testament*, Chico (California).
Lüddekens, E., 1980: 'Aegypten', in Neumann, G. and Untennann, J. (eds.) 1980, pp. 241–265.
Lüdtke, H., 1974: *Historia del léxico románico*, Madrid.
Lumpe, A., 1970: 'Abendlädisches in Byzanz', in *Reallexicon der Byzantinistik*, 4. Amsterdam, pp. 305–306.
Lupas, L., 1972: *Phonologie du grec attique*, The Hague.
McCabe, D., 1981: *The Prose-rhythm of Demosthenes*, New York.
Mackridge, P., 1985: *The Modern Greek Language*, Oxford.
Maloney, G., 1980: 'L'emploi des particules dans les oeuvres d'Hippocrate', *RELO* 1, pp. 1–20.
Maluquer de Motes, J., 1968: *Epigrafía prelatina de la Peninsula ibérica*, Barcelona.
Mandilaras, B. G., 1973: *The Verb in the Greek non-literary Papyri*, Athens.
Marazzi, M., 1985: 'Traffici Minoici e Micenei d'Oltremare: una rassegna su recenti incontri', *QUCC* 50, pp. 107–116.
—— and others (eds.), 1986: *Traffici micenei nel Mediterraneo. Problemi storici e documentazione archeological*, Tarento.
Marouzeau, J., 1949: *Quelques aspects de la formation du Latin littéraire*, Paris.
Marschall, M. H. B., 1987: *Verbs, Nouns and Postpositives in Attic Prosa*, Edinburgh.
Martin, J., 1974: *Antike Rhetorik. Technik und Methode*, Munich.
Martín Zorraquino, M. A., 1997: 'Formación de palabras y lenguaje técnico', *RSEL* 27, pp. 317–339.
Martínez Hernández, M., 2000: *Semñantica del Griego antiguo*. Madrid, Ediciones Clásicas, 2000.
Martínez Vázquez, R. – Ruiz Yanmuza, E., 1999 et alii: *Gramática funcional-cognitiva del griego antiguo*. Sevilla.
Mason, H. J., 1974: *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions*, Toronto.
Masson, O., 1967: *Recherches sur les plus anciens emprunts sémitiques en Grec*, Paris.
——, 1988: 'Le dialecte de Paphos', in Karageorghis, J. and Masson, O. (eds.) 1988, pp. 19–30.

Mastrelli, C. A., 1954: *La lengua di Alceo*, Florence.
Mateo, J., 1977: *El aspecto verbal en el Nuevo Testamento*, Madrid.
Matthews, P. H., 1967: 'The main features of Modern Greek Verb inflection', *FL* 3, pp. 262–284.
Mayser, E., 1926 ff. (2nd ed., 1970): *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, Leipzig.
Meecham, H. G., 1935: *The Letter of Aristeas*, Manchester.
Megas, A. E., 1925–27: *Ἱστορία τοῦ γλωσσικοῦ ζητήματος*, Athens, 2 vols.
Meid, W., 1975: 'Probleme der räumlichen and zeitlichen Gliederung des Indogermanischen', in Rix, H. (ed.), *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*. Regensburg, *9–14 September 1973*, Wiesbaden, pp. 204–219.
Meier-Brügger, M., 1992: *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft*, Berlin-New York.
Meillet, A., 1936: *Esquisse d'une Grammaire comparée de l'armenien classique*, Vienna.
——, 1975 (7th ed.): *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*, Paris.
Meinersmann, B., 1927: *Die lateinischen Wörter und Namen in den griechischen Papyri*, Leipzig.
Meister, K., 1921 (reed. 1965): *Die Homerische Kunstsprache*, Stuttgart.
Méndez Dosuna, A., 1980: 'Clasificación dialectal y cronología relativa: el dialecto eleo' *SPHS* 4, pp. 181–201.
——, 1985: *Los dialectos dorios del Noroeste. Gramática y estudio dialectal*, Salamanca.
Mendoza, J., 1976: 'Aportaciones del estudio de la lengua a la determinación de la cronología de dos tratados del *Corpus Hippocraticum*', *Emerita* 44, pp. 171–195.
Merlingen, W., 1955: *Das vorgriechische und die sprachwissenschaftlichvorhistorischen Grundlagene*, Vienna.
Meyer, G., 1894: *Die slavischen, albanischen und rumdänischen Lehwörter im Neugriechischen*, Vienna.
Michalowski, K., 1938: *Storia de la Nubia cristiana*, Rome.
Migliorini, B., 1968: *Historia de la lengua italiana*, Madrid.
Mihaescu, H., 1993: *La romanité dans le sud-est de l'Europe*, Bucarest.
Millard, A. R., 1991: 'The uses of early Alphabets', in Baurain, C. and others (eds.) 1991, pp. 101–114.
Minniti-Gonia, D., 1992: 'Les théories sur l'origine du dialecte grec de Calabria', *Parousia* 8, pp. 117–124.
Mirambel, A., 1937: *Les états de langue dans la Grèce actuelle*, Paris.
——, 1957: 'La doctrine linguistique de Jean Psichari', *La nouvelle Clio* 3, pp. 78–104.
——, 1959: *La langue greque moderne*, Paris (Greek transl., Thessalonika 1978).
Momigliano, A., 1930: *La composizione della Storia di Tucidide*, Turin.
Moes, R., 1980: *Les Hellénismes de l'époque Théodosienne*, Strasbourg.
Moorhouse, A. C., 1982: *The Syntax of Sophocles*, Leiden.
Moralejo, J. J., 1973a: *Gramática de las inscripciones délficas*, Santiago.
——, 1973b: 'Sonantes y griego micénico', *Emerita* 41, pp. 409–426.
——, 1977a: 'Dialectos y niveles de lengua en griego antiguo', *RSEL* 7, pp. 57–85.
——, 1977b: 'Los dorios: su migración y su dialecto', *Emerita* 45, pp. 243–267.
——, 1979: *Recent contributions to the History of the Greek Dialects*, Santiago.
——, 1984: 'Nota al dativo eólico', *EC* 26, pp. 61–66.
——, 1990: 'Griego antiguo: migraciones y dialectos', *RSEL* 20, pp. 271–308.
——, 1996: 'Posición del dialecto lesbio', in Agud, A. and others (eds.), 1996, pp. 111–127.
Moreno Jurado, S. A., 1997, *Antologia de la Poesía Griega (siglos XI 4 sigs.)*, Madrid.
Morpurgo Davies, A., 1964: '"Doric" Developments in the Language of Hesiod', *Glotta* 62, pp. 138–165.
——, 1968: 'The treatment of **r̥* and **l̥* in Mycenaean and Arcado-Cyprian', in *Atti del 1º Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia. Roma 27 settembre – 3 ottobre 1967*, Rome, vol. II, pp. 791–812.

——, 1984b: 'Mycenaean and Greek Language', in Morpurgo Davies, A. and Duhoux, Y. (eds.), 1984, pp. 75–125.
——, 1992: 'Mycenaean, Arcadian, Cyprian and some questions of Method in Dialectology', in Olivier, J. P. (ed.) 1992, pp. 415–431.
——, and Duhoux, Y. (eds.), 1984a: 'Linear B: A 1984 Survey', Louvain-la-Neuve, pp. 75–125.
Moser, H., 1957: 'Deutsche Sprachgeschichte der ällteren Zeit', in W. Stammler (ed.), Berlin.
Moule, C. D. F., 1968: *An Idiom-Book of the New Testament*, Cambridge.
Moulton, J. H. y Milligan, G., 1914–29: *The Vocabulary of the New Testament illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary Sources*, London.
Mugler, Ch., 1938: *L'évolution des subordonnées relatives complexes en grec*, Paris.
Müllller, D. G., 1980: *Satzbau, Satzgliederung und Satzverbindung in der Prosa Herodots*, Meisenheim.
——, 1982: *Homer and the Ionian Epic Tradition*, Innsbruck.
Musti, D. (ed.), 1985a: *Le origini dei Greci. Dori e mondo egeo*, Rome.
——, 1985b: 'Continuità e discontinuità tra Achei e Dori nelle tradizione storiche', in Musti, D. (ed.) 1985a, pp. 37–71.
—— and others (eds.), 1991: *La Transizione dal Miceneo all'alto arcaismo. Dal palazzo alla citta. Atti del Convegno Internazionale*, 1988, Rome.
Nachmanson, E., 1903: *Laute und Formen der Magnetischen Inschriften*, Uppsala.
——, 1910: *Beiträge zur Kentniss der altgriechishen Volkssprache*, Uppsala-Leipzig.
Nagel, P., 1971: 'Die Einwirkung des Griechischen auf die Intstehung der koptischen Literatursprache', in F. Altheim and R. Stiehl (eds.), *Christentum am Roten Meer*, Berlin.
Nagy, G., 1970: *Greek Dialects and the transformation of Indoeuropean Process*, Cambridge.
Narr, G. (ed.), 1971: *Griechisch und Romanisch*, Tübingen.
Naveh, J., 1982: *Early History of the Alphabet*, Jerusalem/Leiden.
Nebrija, A. de, 1592: *Lexicon hoc est Dictionarium ex sermone latino in hispaniensem*, Salamanca.
——, 1592: *Dictionarium ex hispaniensi en latinum sermonem*, Salamanca.
Negri, A., 1981a: 'La straficazione dell'attico', *KZ* 95, pp. 61–65.
——, 1981b: *Miceneo e lengua omerica*, Florence, 1981.
——, 1982a: 'L'unità intermedia ionico-attica', *Acme* 35, pp. 7–17.
——, 1982b (1984): 'Il problema delle unità intermedie e l'unità intermedia ionico-attica', *ASGM*, 23.
Nehrbass, R., 1935: *Sprache und Stil der Iamata von Epidaurus*, Leipzig.
Nenci, G. and Vallet, G. (eds.), 1977 ff.: *Bibliografia topografica de la colonizzazione greca in Italia e nelle isole tirreniche*, Pisa-Rome.
Neumann, G., 1980: 'Kleinasien', in Neumann, G. and Untertnann, J. (eds.) 1980, pp. 167–185.
—— and Untermann, J. (eds.), 1980: *Die Sprachen im römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit*, Cologne.
Newton, B., 1972: *Cypriot Greek. Its Phonologie and Inflexion*, The Hague-Paris.
Niehoff-Panagiotidis, J., 1994: *Koine und diglossie*, Wiesbaden.
Norden, E., 1958 (5th ed.; 1st ed. 1898): *Die antike Kunstprose*, Stuttgart.
Nöthiger, M., 1971: *Die Sprache des Stesichorus und des Ibycus*, Zurich.
Oeconomidis, D. E., 1908: *Lautlehre des Pontischen*, Leipzig.
Olivier, J. P. (ed.), 1992: *Mykenaïká. Actes du IX[e] Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens organisé par le Centre de l'Antiquité Grecque et Romaine de la Fondation Hellénique des Recherches Scientifiques et l'école Française d'Athènes (Athènes, 2–6 octobre 1990)*, Athens-Paris.
——, 1996: 'Les écritures crétoises: sept points à considérer', in Baurain, C. and others (eds.) 1991, pp. 11–123.

Olivieri, A., 1930; *Frammenti della comedia greca e del mimo nella Sicilia e nella Magna Grecia*, Naples.
Ostrogorsky, G. 1983 (original ed. 1963): *Historia del estado bizantino*, Madrid.
Pabón, J. M., 1939: 'El griego, lengua de la intimidad entre los romanos', *Emerita* 7, pp. 126–131.
Page, D. L., 1963: 'Archilochus and the oral tradition', in AA.VV. 1963, pp. 117–163.
——, 1967 (2nd ed.): *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford.
——, 1974: *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis*, Oxford.
Palaima, Th. G., 1991: 'The advent of the Greek Alphabet in Cyprus: a competition of scripts', in Baurain, C. and others (eds.) 1991, pp. 449–471.
Palm, J., 1955: *Ueber Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien*, Lund.
Palmer, L. R., 1945: *A Grammar of the post-Ptolemaic Papyry*. Vol. I, London.
——, 1958: 'Luwian and Linear A', *TPhS*, pp. 75–110.
——, 1980: *The Greek Language*, Oxford.
Parry, A., 1971: *The Making of Homeric Verse*, Oxford.
Parry, M., 1928: *L'épithète traditionelle dans Homère*, Paris.
Panagl, O., 1992: 'Mykenisch und die Sprache Homers: Alte Probleme, neue Resultate', in J. P. Olivier (ed.) 1992, pp. 499–513.
Panayotis, A., 1990: 'Des dialectes A la koiné: l'exemple de la Chalcidique', *Poikila* 10, pp. 191–228.
——, 1992: '*Ἡ γλώσσα τῶν ἐπιγραφῶν τῆς Μακεδονίας*', Athens.
Papadatos, C. G., 1976: Ἡ ἀνατομία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσας, Athens.
Papadopoulos, A. A., 1927: *Γραμματικὴ τῶν βορείων ἰδιωμάτων τῆν Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσας*, Athens.
——, 1930: '*Οἱ* γαλλισμοί τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης', *Ἀθηνα* 42, pp. 3–33.
——, 1948: '*Η Κρήτη ὑπὸ τους Σαρκηνούς*', Athens.
——, 1955: '*Ιστορικὴ Γραμματικὴ τῆς Ποντικῆς διαλέκτου*', Athens.
Patzer, H., 1972: *Dichter und poetisches Handwerk im Homerischen Epos*, Heidelberg.
Pavese, C. O., 1972: *Tradizioni e generi poetici delta Grecia arcaica*, Rome.
——, 1974: *Studi sulla tradizione epica rapsodica*, Rome.
Peabody, B., 1975: *The winged Word*, New York.
Peek, W., 1955: *Griechische Versinschriften*, I, Berlin.
Perán, P., 1985: *La lengua de la 'Vida de Esopo'*, Unpublished bachelor thesis, Madrid.
Pérez Castro, L., 1997: 'Vocabularios científico-técnicos y léxico común en latín clásico', *RSEL* 27, pp. 107–114.
Pérez Molina, M. E., 1986: 'El Ilamado dialecto sarónico. Revisión crítica', *Myrtia* 1, pp. 107–115.
Pernot, H., 1921: *D'Homère, à nos jours*, Paris.
——, 1927: *Etudes sur la langue des Evangiles*, Paris.
——, 1934: *Introduction à l'étude du dialecte tsaconien*, Paris.
——, 1946: *Morphologie des parlers de Chios*, Paris.
Peters, F. E., 1967: *Greek Philosophical Terms*, New York-London.
Peters, M., 1986: 'Zur Frage einer achädischen Phase des griechischen Epos', in Etter, A. (ed.), *O-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburstag*, Berlin, pp. 303–319.
Petrounias, E., 1978: 'The modem Greek language and diglossia', in S. Vryonis Jr. (ed.), *The Past in Medieval and Modern Greek Culture*, Malibu, pp. 193–220.
Pfohl, G. (ed.), 1968a: *Das Alphabet*, Darmstadt.
——, 1968b: *Elemente der griechischen Epigraphik*, Darmstadt.
Pictet, A, 1859–1863: *Les origines indoeuropéennes ou les Aryas primitifs. Essai de paleontologic linguistique*, Paris.
Pisani, V., 1938: 'Paleontologia Linguistica', in *Annali della Fac. di Lettere e Filosofa delta R. Università di* Cagliari.
——, 1954: *Breve historia de la lengua griega*, Montevideo.

Pittau, M., 1984: *Lessico Etrusco-Latino*, Sassari.
Pohl, W. (ed.), 1997: *Kingdoms of the Empire. The integration of the barbarian in late antiquity*, New York.
Politis, L., 1994: *Historia de la Literatura griega moderna*, Madrid.
Poltera, O., 1997: *Le langage de Simonide*, Berne.
Pope, K. M., 1973 (1st ed. 1934): *From Latin to Modern French*, Manchester.
Porzig, W., 1954: 'Sprachgeographische Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Dialekten', *IF* 61, pp. 147–169.
Powell, B. B., 1991a: *Homer and the origin of the Greek alphabet*, Cambridge.
——, 1991b: 'The Origins of the alphabetic Literacy among the Greeks', in Baurain, C. (ed.), 1991, pp. 357–70.
Powell, J. U., 1925 (reimpr. 1970): *Collectanea Alexandrina*, Oxford.
Probonas, J. K., 1992: *Ἡ Ἑλληνικότητα της Μακεδονίας μέσα στούς αιώνας*, Athens.
Psichari, J., 1886–89: *Essais de grammaire historique du néo-grec*, Paris.
Psomadakis, K., 1995: '*Παραστατική προσβολὴ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ὡς διεθνούς Γλώσσας*', in *Ἑλληνική διεθνής Γλώσσα* 2.
Pugliese Carratelli, G., 1985: *Magna Grecia. Il Mediterraneo, le metropoleis e la fondazione delle colonie*, Milan.
Rabehl, W., *De sermone defixionum atticarum*, thesis, Berlin, 1906.
Raderenacher, L., 1947: *Koiné*, Vienna.
Raubitschek, A. E., 1969: 'Das Denkmal-Epigramm', in AA.VV. 1967, pp. 1–26.
Real Academia Española, 2001 (22nd ed.): *Diccionario de la lengua española*, Madrid.
——, 1998: *Enmiendas y adiciones al Diccionario de la Real Academia Española aprobadas por la Corporación*. Letters A–C, Madrid.
Regard, P., 1924: 'La version grecque du Monument d'Ancyra', *REA* 26, pp. 147–161.
Renfrew, C., 1987: *Archaeology and Language. The Puzzle of Indoeuropean Origins*, Cambridge (Sp. transl., Barcelona, 1990).
Risch, E., 1955: 'Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekten in neuer Sicht', *MH* 12, pp. 61–76.
——, 1966: 'Les différences dialectales dans le mycénien', in *Cambridge Colloquium*, Cambridge, pp. 150–157.
——, 1974: *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, Berlin.
——, 1979: 'Die griechische Dialekte im 2. vorchristlichen Jahrtausend', *SMEA* 20, pp. 91–101.
——, 1985: 'La posizione del dialetto dorico', in Musti, D. (ed.) 1985a, pp. 13–35.
——, 1988: 'Le développement du chipriote dans le cadre des dialectes grecs anciens', in Karageorghis, J. and Masson, O. (eds.) 1988, pp. 67–80, Nicosia.
——, 1991: 'La contribution de la langue mycénienne au problème de la transition du palais à la cité', in Musti, D. (ed.) 1991, pp. 231–240.
Rix, H., 1992: *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen*, Darmstadt.
Rizzi, E., 1981: 'Il dorico di Creta: aspetti e problemi della struttura fonematica', *Studi italiani di linguistics teorica ed applicata*, pp. 251–282.
Rocca, G., 1984: *Continuità micenee nel dorico*, Milan.
Rodríguez Monescillo, E., 1975: *Estudios sobre la lengua de Aristófanes*, Madrid.
Rodríguez Somolinos, H., 1998a: *El léxico de los poetas lesbios*, Madrid.
—— (1998b): 'Inscriptiones Graecae Antiquissimae Iberiae', in Gangutia Elicegui, E., *Testimonia Hispaniae Antiqua*, Madrid, II. pp. 335–363.
Rohlfs, G., 1950: *Historische Grammatik der unteritalischen Gräzität*, Munich.
——, 1962: *Neue Beiträge zur Kenntnis der unteritalischen Gräzität*, Munich.
Romero Cruz, F., 1988: 'En tono a los proemios y epilogos de Tucidides', in G. Morocho (ed.), *Estudios de Drama y Retórica en Grecia y Roma*, León pp. 155–167.
Rosén, H. B., 1962: *Eine Laut- und Formenlehre der Herodoteischen Sprachform*, Heidelberg.

——, 1963: 'Palestinian κοινή in Rabbinic Illustration', *JSS* 8, pp. 56–72.
——, 1979: *L'hébreu et ses rapports avec le monde classique*, Paris 1979.
——, 1980: 'Die Sprachsituation im römischen Palästina', in Neumann, G. and Untermann, J. (eds.) 1980, pp. 215–239.
Rosenkranz, B., 1930: 'Der lokale Grundton und die persönliche Eigenart in der Sprache des Thukydides', *IF* 35, pp. 127–178.
Rotolo, V., 1965: *A. Korais e la questione della lengua en Grecia*, Palermo.
Roura, C., 1971: 'La indeterminación sintáctica en Tucidides y los problemas de la traducción', *Emerita* 39, pp. 121–127.
Rudberg, G., 1942: 'Herakleitos und Gorgias', *Serta Eitremiana*, Oslo, pp. 128–140.
Ruijgh, C. J., 1957: *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique*, Assen.
——, 1967: *Études sur la Grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec Mycénien*, Amsterdam.
——, 1984: 'Le mycénien et Homère', in Morpurgo, A. and Duhoux, Y. 1984, pp. 75–125.
——, 1995: 'D'Homère aux origines de la tradition épique', in Crielaard, J. P. (ed.), *Homeric Questions*, Amsterdam, pp. 1–96.
——, 1995–96: 'La genèse de l'éolien d'Asie', *Verbum* 18, pp. 289–297.
——, 1996: 'Sur la position dialectale du mycénien', in De Miro, E. and others (eds.) 1996, pp. 115–124.
Rydbeck, L. 1967: *Fachprosa, vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament*, Uppsala.
Sacconi, A., 1991: 'I sistemi grafici del monde egeo tra la fine del II e l'inizio del I millennio a. C.', in Musti, D. (ed.) 1991, pp. 43–52.
Sakellariou, M., 1980: *Les proto-grecs*, Athens.
Santana Henríquez, G., 1991: 'En torno a la composición en la prosa médica griega antigua', *Emerita* 59, pp. 123–132.
Santiago, R. A., 1997: 'La dialectologia griega, hoy', in Bosch, M. C. and Fornés, M. A. (eds.), *Homenatge a Miquel Dolç. Actes del XII Simposi de la Secció Catalana i de la Secció Balear de la S.E.E.C.*, pp. 13–30.
Scarpat, G., 1952: *I dialetti Greci in Omero secondo un grammatico antico*, Milan.
Schachermeyer, F., 1980: *Griechenland im Zeitalter der Wanderungen*, Vienna.
Schrader, O., y Nehring, A., 1917–29: *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde*, I–II, Berlin-Leipzig, 1917–1929.
Scherer, A., 1963: 'Die Sprache des Archilochos', in AA.VV. 1963, pp. 89–116.
Schmid, W., 1964 (1st ed. 1896–97): *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern*, Hildesheim, 5 vols.
Schmift, R., 1967: *Dichtung und dichtersprache im idg. Zeit*, Wiesbaden, 1967.
——, 1977: *Einführung in die griechischen Dialekte*, Darmstadt.
Schwyzer, E., and Debrunner, A., 4 vols., 1975 (4th ed., 1st ed. 1939 ff.): *Griechische Grammatik*, Munich.
See, K. von (ed.), 1978: *Europäische Heldendichtung*, Darmstadt.
Semenov, A., 1935: 'Der nordpontischen Dialekt des Neugriechischen', *Glotta* 23, pp. 96–107.
Seiler, H.-J., 1952: *L'aspect et le temps dans le verbe néo-grec*, Paris.
——, 1958: 'Das Problem der sogenanten Geminaten in den neugriecmschen Dialekten . . .', *Glotta* 36, p. 209 ff.
Sevcenko, I., 1982: 'Levels of Style in Byzantine Prose', *JÖB* 31, pp. 281–312 and 32, pp. 220–233.
Shipp, G. S., 1964: 'Mycenaean Evidence for the Homeric Dialect', in G. S. Kirk (ed.), *The Language and Background of Homer*, Cambridge, pp. 1–14.
Shipp, G. P., 1972 (2nd ed.): *Studies in the Language of Homer*, Cambridge.
Sicca, U., 1924: *Grammatica delle Iscrizioni Doriche delta Sicilia*, Arpino.
Skoda, F., 1988: *Médicene ancienne et métaphore. Le vocabulaire de l'anatomie et de la pathologie en grec ancien*, Paris.
Snell, B., 1969: *Tyrtaios und die Sprache des Epos*, Göttingen.

Soesbergen, P. G. van, 1981: 'The coming of the dorians', *Kadmos* 20, pp. 38–51.
Sommer, F., (3rd ed.), 1948: *Handbuch der Lateinischen Laut und Formenlehre*, Heidelberg.
Sophocles, E. A., 1914 (3rd ed., reprint, 1975): *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)*, Cambridge.
Sotiropoulos, D., 1972: *Noun Morphology of Modern Demotic Greek*, The Hague.
Sperber, D., 1984: *A Dictionary of Greek and Latin Legal Terms in Rabbinic Literature*, Bar Ilan.
Stammler, W., (ed.), 1952: *Deutsche Philologie im Aufriss*, I, Berlin.
Starr, Ch. G., 1964; *Gli origini della civiltà greca*, Rome.
Stavrianopulu, P. (ed.), 1996: *Πιό κοντά στήν Ελλάδα* 11, Madrid.
——, 1997: *Πιό κοντά στήν Ελλάδα* 12–13, Madrid.
——, 1998: *Πιὸ κοντά στήν Ελλάδα* 14, Madrid.
——, 1999: *Πιὸ κοντά στήν Ελλάδα* 15, Madrid.
Steiner-Weber, A., 1991: 'Merkmale der byzantinischen Wortbildung anhand der Komposition', in Hörandner, W. and Trapp, E. (eds.) 1991, pp. 235–248.
Steinger, G., 1957: *Epische Elemente im Redestil des Herodot*, Kiel.
Stephanus, H., 1831–65 (reprint, 1954): *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, Paris.
Stevens, P. T., 1976: *Colloquial expressions in Euripides*, Wiesbaden.
Stichel, R., 1991: 'Die Bedeutung der mittelalterlichen slavischen Uebersetzungliteratur für die byzantinische Lexicographie', in Hörandner, W. and Trapp, E. (eds.) 1991, pp. 249–282.
Streitberg, W., 1919 (2nd ed.): *Die gothische Bibel*, Heidelberg.
Striano, A., 1987: 'Sobre los supuestos lesbismos del dialecto cirenaico', *Emerita* 55, pp, 335–344.
Strunck, K., 1957: *Die sogenannte Aeolismen der homerischen Sprache*, Köln.
——, 1997: 'Vom Mykenischen bis zum klassischen Griechisch', in H.-G. Nesselrath (ed.), *Einleitung in die griechische Philologie*, Stuttgart-Leipzig.
Stubbings, F. H., 1963: *The Rise of Mycenaean Civilization*, Cambridge.
——, 1975: *The recession of Mycenaean Civilization*, Cambridge.
Stüber, K., 1996: *Zur dialektalen Einheit des Ostionischen*, Innsbruck.
Sturtevant, E. H., 1933 (2nd ed. New-Haven-London 1942): *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*, Philadelphia.
——, 1962: 'The Indo-Hittite Hypothese', *Language* 38, pp. 101–110.
Swain, S., 1996: *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism and Power in the Greek World*, Oxford.
Sznol, X., 1989: 'Ejemplos del griego rabínico a través del tesoro lexicográfico del *DGE*', *Emerita* 57, pp. 329–343.
Tarrant, D., 1946: 'Colloquialisms, Semi-proverbs and Wordplay in Plato', *CQ* 40, pp. 109–117.
——, 1958: 'More Colloquialisms, Semi-proverbs and Wordplay in Plato', *CQ* N. S. 8, pp. 158–160.
Taylour, W., 1983 (1st ed. 1964): *The Mycenaeans*, Cambridge.
Theodorsson, S., *The phonemic System of the Attic Dialect 400–340 B.C.*, Lund, 1974.
——, 1977: *The Phonology of the Ptolemaic Koine*, Lund.
Thesleff, H., 1967: *Studies in the Styles of Plato*, Helsinki.
Thévenot-Warelle, A., 1988: *Le dialecte grec d'Élide. Phonétique et Morphologie*, Nancy.
Thompson, D. W., 1928: 'On Egyptian Fishnames used by Greek Writers', *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 14, 1928 I–II.
Threatte, L., 1980–1996: *The Grammar of Attic inscriptions*, Berlin, vols. 1–11.
Thumb, A., 1885: *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache*, Strassbourg.
——, 1916: 'Die griechischen Lehnwörter im Armenischen', *BZ* 9, p. 388 ff.
——, 1974 (1st ed. 1901): *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, Strassbourg.
—— and Kieckers, E., 1939: *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, I, Heidelberg.
—— and Scherer, A., 1959: *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, II, Heidelberg.

Tobaídis, D. E., 1988: *Ἡ ποντιακὴ διάλεκτος*, Athens.
Tovar, A., 1944: 'Ensayo sobre la estratigrafía de los dialectos griegos. I. Primitiva extensión geográfica del Jonio', *Emerita* 12, pp. 245–335.
Tovar, S. A., 1990: *Biografía de la lengua griega*, Santiago de Chile.
Traglia, A., 1952: *Studi sulla lengua di Alceo*, Bari.
——, 1952: *Studi sulla lengua di Empedocle*, Bari.
Trapp, E. and others, *Studien zur Byzantinischen Lexicographie*, Vienna 1988.
——, 1988: 'Stand und Perspektiven der mittelgriechischen Lexicographie', in E. Trapp (ed.), *Studien zur Byzantinischen Lexicographie*, Vienna, pp. 11–46.
——, Hörandner, W. and Diethart, J., 1994 ff.: *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität (besonders des 9.–12. Jahrhunderts)*, Vienna.
Triandaphyllidis, M., 1909: *Die Lehnwörter der mittelgriechischen Vulgärliteratur*, Strassbourg.
——, καὶ ἐπιτροπῆς, 1941: *Νεοελληνικὴ Γραμματικὴ (τῆς Δημοτικῆς)*, Athens.
——, 1981 (1st ed., Athens, 1946): *Νεοελληνικὴ Γραμματικὴ (Ἱστορικὴ Εἰσαγωγή)*, Thessalonica.
Troxler, H., 1964: *Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods*, Zürich.
Trümpy, C., 1986: *Vergleich des Mykenischen mit der Sprache der Chorlyrik*. Frankfurt am Main and New York.
Tsekourakis, D., 1974: *Studies in the Terminology of early Stoic Ethics*, Wiesbaden.
Tseskhladze, G. and de Angelis, F. (eds.), 1994: *The Archaeology of Greek Colonization*. Oxford.
Tsopanakis, A., 1994: *Νεοελληνικὴ Γραμματική*, Athens.
Tsopanakis, A. G., 1979: 'Onomatologia omerica', *QUCC*, N. S., 1, 1979, pp. 83–90.
——, 1993: ''Αναζήτησι καταλοίπων τῆς ἀρχαίας Μακεδονικῆς 'Ελληνικῆς' in *Ἑλληνικὴ Διαλεκτολογία* 3, pp. 61–82.
Ullmann, B. L., 1968: 'Wie alt ist das griechische Alphabet', in G. Pfohl (ed.) 1968a, pp. 214–220; 'Ein Beleg für die Buchstabenfolge unseres Alphabets aus dem 14. Jahrhundert vor Christus', ibid., pp. 221–32.
Unterenann, J., 1987: *Einführung in die Sprache Homers*, Heidelberg.
Untersteiner, M., 1949: *La lengua di Erodoto*, Bari.
Urmson, J. O., 1990: *The Greek Philosophical Vocabulary*, London.
Ursing, U., 1930: *Studien zur griechischen Fabel*, Lund.
Van Brock, N., 1961, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire médical du grec ancien*, Paris.
Van der Velde, R., 1924: *Thessalische Dialektgeographie*, Nijmegen.
Van Groningen, B., 1958: *La composition littéraire archaique grecque*, Amsterdam.
Vasiliev, A. A., 1946 (original ed. 1928–29): *Historia del imperio bizantino. De Constantino a las Cruzadas*, Barcelona.
Vayacacos, D. V., 1972a: *Le grec moderne, les dialectes néohelléniques et le dictionnaire historique de la langue grecque de l'Académie d'Athènes*, Athens.
——, 1972b: Γλωσσικὴ συγγένεια Κρήτης καὶ Μάνης, *Λεξιχογραφικόν δελτίον*, pp. 3–42.
Verdier, Ch., 1972: *Les éolismes non-épiques de la langue de Pindare*, Innsbruck.
Vemet, J., 1978: *La cultura hispano-árabe en Oriente y Occidente*, Barcelona.
Viereck, P., 1888: *Sermo graecus quo senatus populusque romanus magistratusque populi romani usque ad Tiberii Caesaris aetatem utebantur*, Gotemburgo. Vilborg, E., 1960: *A tentative Grammar of mycenaean Greek*, Gotenburg.
Villar, F., 1996a (2nd ed.): *Los indoeuropeos y los origines de Europa. Lenguaje e historia*, Madrid.
—— and d'Encarnaçao, J. (eds.), 1996b: *La Hispania prerromana*, Salamanca.
Vineis, E. (ed.), 1983: *Le lingue indoeuropee di frammentaria attestazione*, Pisa, pp. 135–151.
Viscidi, F., 1944: *I prestiti latini nel greco antico e bizantino*, Padua.
Vottéro, G., 1996: 'Koinès et koinas en Béotie à l'époque dialectale', in Brixhe, C. (ed.) 1996a, pp. 43–92.
Vries, J. de, 1963: *Heroic Song and heroic Legend*, London.

Wachter, R., 1989: 'Zur Vorgeschichte des griechischen Alphabets', *Kadmos* 28, pp. 19–78.
Wahlgren, St., 1995: *Sprachwandel im Griechischen der frühen Kaiserzeit*, Gotenburg.
Wahrmann, P., 1907: *Prolegomena zu einer Geschichte der griechischen Dialekten im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, Wien.
Walburton, I. P., 1970: 'Greek Diglossia and the true aspects of the Phonology of Common Modern Greek', *JL* 16, pp. 45–54.
Wathelet, P., 1970: *Les traits éolien dans la langue de l'épopée grecque*, Rome.
——, 1991: 'Les datifs analogiques en -εσσι', *REG* 104, pp. 1–14.
Watkins, C., 1995: 'El protoindoeuropeo', in Giacalone, A. and Ramat, P. (eds.), *Las lenguas indoeuropeas*, Madrid, pp. 57–117.
Webster, T. B. L., 1958: *From Mycenae to Homer*, London.
Weierholt, K., 1963: *Studien im Sprachgebrauch des Malalas*, Oslo.
Weise, O., 1882: *Die griechische Wörter in Latein*, Leipzig.
Wenskuns, O., 1982: *Ringskomposition, anaphorisch-rekapitulierende Verbindung und anknüpfende Wiederholung im Hippokratischen Corpus*, Frankfurt.
Widmann, H., 1935: *Beiträge zur Syntax Epikurs*, Stuttgart-Berlin.
Willets, F. R., 1988: 'Early Greek in Cyprus', in Karageorghis, J. and Masson, O. (eds.) 1988, pp. 39–54.
Windekens, A. J. van, 1952: *Le pélasgique*, Louvain.
Witte, K., 1913: 'Homer, Sprache', in *RE* VIII 13–47.
Woodward, R. C., 1986: 'The Dentalization of the Labiovelars in Greek', *IF* 91, pp. 129–154.
Zaragoza, J. and González Senmartí, A., 1989: 'Reflexions sur le lexique dans les Epidémies II, IV, V, VI, VII', in *Die hippokratischen Epidemien. Theorie, Praxis, Tradition. Verhandlungen der V[e] Colloque International Hipporcratique* (G. Baader et al. eds.), Stuttgart.
Zgusta, L., 1980: 'Die Rolle des Griechischen im römischen Kaiserzeit', in G. Neumann and J. Untermann (eds.) 1980, pp. 121–145.
Zilliacus, H., 1935: *Zum Kampf der Weltsprachen im oströmischen Reich*, Helsinfors.
Zumbach, O., 1955: *Neuerungen in der Sprache der Homerischen Hymnen*, Winterthur.
Zuntz, G., 1939: 'Earliest Attic Prosa Style (On Antiphon's second Tetralogy)', *Classica et Medievalia* 2, pp. 121–144.

INDEX

The numbers in this index refer to paragraph numbers, not to page numbers.

acclamations of the stadium: language, 336
Achaean epic: 81 ff.; origin, 89
Aeolic: 121 ff.; in Homer, 144 ff.
Alcaeus and Sappho: language, 176 ff.
alphabet: Greek, 100 ff.; Etruscan, 110; derived from Greek, 110 f.; Iberian, 306; Gothic, 308
Antiphon: language, 213, 217
Arab: 309, 314; invasion, 315; borrowings from Greek, 386 ff.
Aramaic: influence in koine, 254; influence from Greek, 305
Arcado-Cyprian: 119 f.; precedents, 90
Aristophanes: language, 225
Armenian: influence of Greek, 306
Attic lexicon: scientific vocabulary, 236 ff.
Attic scholia: language, 189
Attic: in Ionic inscriptions, 195; oldest Attic prose, 212 ff.; mature prose, 219 ff.; variants in prose, 223 ff.; scientific lexicon, 234 ff.; diffusion, 247
atticism: 275 ff.

Bacchylides: language, 171
biblical Greek: 255 f.
Boeotian: 180
Bulgarian: 381
Byzantine Greek: popular language, 330 ff., 341 ff.; Latin borrowings, 356 ff.; borrowings from Gothic and the easten languages, 359 ff.; borrowings from western languages, 363 ff.; borrowings in other languages, 366 ff.; borrowings in western languages, 369 ff.; borrowings in Slavic, 379 ff.; borrowings in Arab, 383 ff.
Byzantine lexicon: 352 ff.
Byzantium: historical context of Greek, 311 ff.; literature, 316 ff., 327 ff.

Callimachus and Chrysorrhoe: language, 351
Callinus: language, 158
Cicero: 297
colonization: 95 ff.
colloquial koine: 252 f.; local variants, 261 f.; vulgar koine: 262 f.; general description, 264 ff.
comedy: language, 208, 210
Common Greek: his existence, 28 f.; essential characteristics, 30 ff.; variants, 36 ff.
Coptic: 304
Corinna: language, 180 ff.
Chios: modenr dialect, 442
choral lyric: language, 162 ff.
Chronicle of the Morea: language, 350

Demotic: influence of Greek, 304
Digenis Akritas: language, 349
Dorian: 125 f.
Dorians: arrival, 53 ff.

East Greek: 68 ff.; precedents in CG, 38 f.; variants, 90, 112 ff.
Egyptian: influence in koine, 254
elegy: language, 155 ff.
epic: v. Achaean epic, Homer
epigram: language, 160 f.
Eteo-Cretan: 59
Ethiopian: influence of Greek, 306
Etruscan: alphabet, 110

Fables from the Vindobonensis collection: language, 339

Germanic: 308; hellenisms, 378
Gorgias: language, 213, 217
Gothic: alphabet, 308
Greek inscriptions: 108 ff.
Greek: in the 2nd millenium, 46; Pre-Greek elements, 62 ff.; expansion in the first millenium, 92 ff.; inscriptions, 104 ff.; unifying isoglosses, 127 ff.; differences in the first millenium, 130 ff.; general literary languages, 133 ff.; specific literary languages, 175 ff.; Ionic

and Attic literary languages, 185 ff.; influence of Latin, 257 ff.; contacts with other languages, 286 ff.; coexistence with Latin within the empire, 287 f.; in Rome, 289 ff.; influence of othe languages, 304 ff.
Greek-Latin: 387 ff., 406 ff.; in Spanish lexicon, 413 ff.; international character, 415 f.
Greeks: expansion and arrival to Greece, 40 ff.

hellenisms: in western languages in the high middle ages, 390 ff.; in Castilian (centuries xiv–xvi), 393 ff.; in French (centuries xiv–xvi), 397; in Italian (centuries xiv–xvi), 398; in English (centuries xiv–xvi), 399; in Castilian (centuries xvi–xviii), 400 f.; in German (centuries xvii–xviii), 402; in Italian (centuries xvii–xviii), 402; in Castilian (centuries xix–xx), 403 ff.
Herodot: language, 199 ff.
Hesiod: language, 151 f.
hippocratics: language, 205, 231 ff.
Homer: language, 85 ss, 136 ff.; formulaic diction, 140 ff.; dialectal forms, 143 ff.; artificial forms, 146; problems of transmission, 148
Homeric Hymns: language, 153

Iambographers: language, 187 ff.
Iberian: alphabet, 306
Indo-European: monothematic (IE II), 19; polithematic (IE I1l), 19; IIIA, 23 f., 26; IIIA and Greek, 21
Indo-Europeans: origins, 1 ff.; invasions, 5 ff.; point of departure, 6 ff.; theories about home and expansion, 7 ff.; culture, 13 ff.; cultural vocabulary, 16 f.
Ionians: origin, 118
Ionic-Attic: 116 ff.; precedents, 90
Ionic: in Homer, 144 ff.; prose, 191 ff.; Iambographers, 187 ff.; inscriptions, 194; in Attic prose, 242

koine: origin, definition, levels, 240 ff.; diffusion, 247 ff.; influence in dialects, 250 ff.; influence in other languages, 254 ff.

Latin: influence in koine, 257 ff.; Hellenization, 110, 294 ff.; in the East and Byzantium, 287 f. christian hellenisms, 298
Lesbian: 118, 122, 177 f., 183
literary koine: the first stage, 271 ff.
literary Syracusan: 183 ff.

Macedonian: 60 f.
Malalas: language, 338
Minoans and Mycenaean expansion: 42 ff.
Modern Cyprian: 442
Modern Greek: general panorama, 417 ff., 443; description, 425 ff.; borrowings and culture words, 432 ff.; dialects, 437 ff., 443 ff.
Mycenaean: 73 ff.; texts, 76; linguistic features, 77 ff.

Neolithic in Greece: 59
Nubian: 309

oral Attic: fuentes, 208; general features, 206 ff.; characteristics, 209 ff.

Para-Mycenaean: 90
Pelasgian: 57, 64 f.
Phrygian: 110; influjo del griego, 305
Plato: language, 221, 270
post-Homeric epic: language, 149 ff.
Pre-Greek languages: 57 ff.
Prodromos: language, 348
Proto-Bulgarian inscriptions: language, 337

rabbinic Hebrew: influence of Greek, 305
ritual lyric: language, 173

Sappho: v. Alcaeus
scientific Greek lexicon: presocratics, 197, 227 ff.; hippocratics, 233 ff.; Attic literature, 236 ff.; example of a system, 238; sources, 281; general description, 282 ff.
Sea Peoples: 47
semitisms in Greece: 255
Semonides: language, 159
Simonides: language, 171
Slavic: 379 ff.; borrowings from Greek, 382

Socrates: language, 211
Solon: language, 189
syllabaries: 49 ff.
Syriac: influence of Greek, 306

Theocrit: language, 185
Thrasymachus: language, 213, 217

Thucydides: language, 218, 225
tragedy: language, 172, 208
Tsaconian: 440, 442
Tyrtaeus: language, 159

West Greek: 53 ff., 125 ff.

Xenophon: language, 226